UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



FOUNDED 1836

WASHINGTON, D.C.

B19574

144

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

MR. GRANVILLE SHARPE PATTISON,

AND

DR. N. CHAPMAN.

SECOND EDITION, WITH EXPLANATORY REMARKS.

Mon. Med.
WZ
100
P321c
1821a

PREFACE.

NO honourable man can expect that I should degrade myself by noticing, with a view to a formal refutation, the calumnies, resting on his authority only, which have been raised against my character by so infamous an individual as Granville Sharpe Pattison! But to gratify the curiosity which has eagerly sought my first publication, as well as to furnish a clear and just exposition of the origin of the controversy with him, I have had a second edition, the former being very limited, of the pamphlet printed, with a few explanatory remarks.

This concise statement of facts is now submitted to the Public, with the whole of the proceedings, duly authenticated, of the Court of Judicature of Edinburgh, which convicted Mrs. Catharine Ure of an *adulterous intercourse* with the said Granville Sharpe Pattison!

N. CHAPMAN.

Philadelphia, August, 1821.

400478

To have added certificates to the ensuing statement, would have rendered the publication inconveniently long. But with a view of guarding against inaccuracies, I submitted the manuscript to each of the gentlemen whose names are introduced, and am authorized to say, that the averments in every instance, are correct and true.

CORRESPONDENCE, &c.

IT seems to me proper, on several accounts, that the ensuing Correspondence should be laid before the public; and, in order to render the subject to which it relates, more intelligible, I shall add a few remarks.

Baltimore, 12*th Oct.* 1820.

SIR,

When the slightest insinuation is thrown out against the character of a man of honour, it becomes his painful duty, to seek that redress, which as a gentleman he is intitled to demand, and no one, if he has injured another, can refuse. Since my arrival in this country, much has been done by certain individuals, to hurt my reputation; and I have frequently heard, but in a manner which prevented me seeking an explanation, that you had used great liberties in speaking of my character. As I am determined that no person shall, with impunity, couple my name with either a mean or dishonourable action; my present object in addressing you, is to ascertain whether you have asserted, that you believe me to be the author of an anonymous letter said to have been received by you last winter, and at present handing about in Philadelphia.

That I may immediately know how to proceed in this affair, I have to request that you will answer this letter, (which, to prevent any mistake, shall be delivered into your hands by Dr. Eberle,) by return of post.

I have the honour to be,

Sir, your obedient servant,

GRANVILLE SHARPE PATTISON.

For Dr. CHAPMAN, &c. &c. &c.

Baltimore, 17*th Oct.* 1820.

SIR,

Mr. Pattison called on me last week for the purpose of getting me to accompany him to Philadelphia as his friend, to require of you an explanation of a report injurious to his character, which he had reason to believe had emanated from you. The exalted character, which I have ever entertained of you for honour and justice, induced me to advise him to write you the letter delivered into your own hands by Doctor Eberle on Friday evening—to which he has not yet received any answer. Unwilling that this affair should be brought to a disagreeable conclusion, I have again prevailed on Mr. Pattison to delay his departure to Philadelphia, until a reply to this is due, when I hope to receive from you such an answer as will enable me to make an arrangement, at once honourable and satisfactory to the parties concerned.

I have the honour to be,

Sir, your obedient servant,

C. MACAULEY.

Doctor N. CHAPMAN.

P. S. That this should come safe into your own hand, I have enclosed it to Doctor Eberle, with the request that he should deliver it without delay. C. M.

SIR,

In answer to your letter of the 17th inst. I have only to observe, that from various facts which have come to my knowledge, of the character and conduct of Mr. Pattison, as well in relation to the causes which compelled him to leave Scotland, as to events which have subsequently happened, I have determined to hold no communication with him, by correspondence or otherwise.

If any further proceedings on the part of Mr. P. should render it necessary, I shall take an opportunity, through the medium of the press, of assigning the reasons which have led me to this decision.

I am, Sir very respectfully
Your obedient servant,

To Dr. C. MACAULAY, &c. N. CHAPMAN.

Philadelphia, Oct. 19, 1820.

In the course of the last winter, a series of anonymous letters were addressed to Dr. Physick and myself, of a very offensive nature. Circumstances led us to suspect, that if not written by Mr. Pattison, he was at least privy to their production. They were marked by *Scotticisms*, had *several phrases peculiar* to the *medical schools of Scotland*, and aimed at the object, which we well understood, was steadily pursued by himself and friends, of forcing Dr. Gibson and Dr. Horner out of their positions in our University, to make way for his own admission. That these letters, however, were circulated, or indeed shown to any person, except to Dr. Dewees and Dr. Horner, I do deny.* The latter gentleman tells me, of which I was not aware, that he did speak of them unreservedly, as the probable production of Mr. Pattison, *which imputation he caused to be communicated to him, through the medium of his friends, with a mes-*

* One letter lately to Dr. R. M. Patterson.

*sage, that he was prepared to render him any redress which he might exact.**

In directing his interrogatory to this point alone, Mr.

* These repeated invitations are disregarded. It comported much better with the views of Mr. Pattison, to provoke me to a controversy with him, from which, in no event, could I hope to escape without some degradation to myself, and injury to the school of which I am a member.

That there was not the slightest pretext to call on me, on the grounds alleged, is conclusively shown, by his failing to establish the grievance of which he complained. No evidence whatever does he adduce of my having circulated the anonymous letters, or of even speaking of them publicly.

Being really actuated by the motives which he avows, why did he not meet Dr. Horner? Delicately alive to every imputation on his honour, what is the reason he overlooked Dr. Gibson, who, he tells us, went to Baltimore for the express purpose of traducing his reputation, and in execution of this design, propagated reports concerning him, "the most foul, the most malignant, and the most false,"—going so far as even to assert, that "my character *was so infamous* in Philadelphia, that every respectable family had closed their doors against me?"†

These, surely, were provocations sufficient to arouse the spirit of a cavalier of such exquisite sensibilities. Two considerations led him to select me as the object of attack. Estimating his character as I did, he was persuaded, that under scarcely any circumstances could I meet him—and he hoped that there might grow out of the negotiations incident to the occasion, an arrangement, which would suppress the disclosure I had threatened, of the affair of Mrs. Ure, an event which he uniformly deprecated, as inevitably leading to his ruin. To secure, however, himself against every possible danger, he postpones the affair till the meeting of the classes, when he was aware that my hands must be tied by all the obligations of duty, decorum, and propriety.

† Vide Mr. Pattison's Pamphlet, p. 17

Pattison obviously hoped to evade a subject, on which he knew I had spoken often, and without disguise. To repel a charge preferred against Dr. Physick and myself, and which we learnt was most industriously propagated in Baltimore, especially of having brought him to this country, and afterwards very wantonly persecuting him—I had on several occasions, distinctly declared such allegations to be utterly false,—that, on the contrary, he was driven hither by an incensed public, in consequence of a most odious deed, hereafter to be explained,—and, that our reception and treatment of him were kind in the extreme, till he forfeited every claim to our notice, by the development of his character, and the particular reprehensibility of his conduct towards us.

The history of his visit to the United States may be told in a few words. Early in November 1818, Mr. John Pattison, the brother, announces to him the vacancy in our school, by the death of Dr. Dorsey, with his advice to become a candidate for the chair. The intelligence is received late in December—he determines to do so, and letters of recommendation of this date, are procured and transmitted to Dr. Physick and myself, which were received on the twelfth of April—and here commenced our knowledge of Mr. Granville Pattison.

He did not contemplate, at first, coming to this country. In March,* however, Dr. Ure, of Glasgow, sues out and obtains a divorce from his wife, on the ground of an *adulterous intercourse* with Mr. Pattison. As must happen in every community which retains any sense of virtue, or the positive obligations of religion, a clamour is raised against him, which, finding he could not resist, he repairs to London,

* This is incorrect. The divorce was obtained on the 5th of February. Vide Documents.

lingers there a few weeks, and then embarks for this country.*

What is the degree of Mr. Pattison's guilt in this transaction, I shall not take on myself to determine. This is now a matter between himself and his God. Documents, however, which I have seen, prove that he was at the time, the colleague of Dr. Ure, in the Andersonian Institution—that he habitually visited in his family, one of the most respectable in Glasgow, and that the transgression did not proceed from the temporary ascendancy of passion over moral restraint, but was lengthened out and aggravated by repeated assignations,† &c. &c.

* This is now put beyond the possibility of doubt. I have lately been assured by Dr. Dewees, that he has seen a letter to Mr. John Pattison, from a *very near* relative, about the date of the receipt here of the recommendations of his brother, stating—that in consequence of the clamour excited in Glasgow against him, on account of *his amour with Mrs. Ure*, he had determined to quit that city, and seek a settlement in London. He does so accordingly: but not meeting with encouragement, he sets sail for this country, in the spirit of an adventurer, to try anew his fortune—and such is the true history of his emigration!

† The whole matter is now disclosed. It appears from the evidence on the trial in which Mrs. Ure was convicted of adultery with Granville Sharpe Pattison, that *he deliberately seduced the wife of his confiding friend, the intimate associate of his family, and especially of an unmarried sister, the mother of numerous children, and whom, after having thus ruined, he leaves in absolute beggary, in an obscure town, pregnant by him,—and finally, to promote his sinister views, he causes to make a false statement under the pretext of procuring for her alimony, and the privilege of seeing her children !!!* Thus it is abundantly shown, that his conduct, as I had before stated, was not the result of momentary impulse,—not the single triumph of passion over regulated principle,—that it was not an act into which he was surprised by the

As stated, such I sincerely believe to be the cause of Mr. Pattison's emigration. But this is denied, and he complains of being allured hither by the promises of Dr. Physick and myself.

Where is the evidence of the fact? It is said to be contained in a letter from Dr. Dewees, which I have never been able to see. But I learn from the author of it, that to the best of his recollection, it merely acquaints Mr. Pattison, that it is the opinion of two gentlemen, not designated by name, who are well qualified to judge, that whatever may be the weight of his credentials, he can not possibly succeed in his application, without being personally present, and therefore, advises his coming.

It is not pretended that the letter was written with my privity or consent. The fact is, I knew nothing even of its existence till seven or eight months subsequent to its date. Even allowing the reverse, it is still susceptible of proof, that it could not and did not supply the motive of Mr. Pattison's removal. The date of the letter cannot be exactly ascertained. But I am assured by Dr. Dewees, that it must have been written very late in April, and therefore, in all probability, it was forwarded by the New-York packet of the 10th of May, the stated period for the sailing of these vessels, and I have one from Mr. Stirling, of London, of the 27th of the same month, in which the immediate embarkation of Mr. Pattison for the United States is mentioned.

infirmities of his nature, or a temporary oblivion of moral and religious obligation, and of which, in a season of reflection, he became contrite and repentant—but, on the contrary, it proceeded from an utter insensibility to all those sacred influences, from mere distempered pruriency, settled and confirmed in habits of incorrigible depravity.

By the preceding statement, a train of reflections is suggested. Why, it will be asked, did not Mr. John Pattison call on Dr. Physick and myself, to ascertain how far such a communication was authorized ?—what was the nature and degree of support we were prepared to afford, as well as the prospect of success in the proposed application for the professorship ? Can it be presumed for a moment, that any man situated as Mr. Granville Pattison is described to have been at the time, triumphant as a teacher, prosperous as a practitioner, devoted to his country, surrounded by family and friends, would break such ties, and surrender up such certainties for an attainment so indefinite and precarious ?

Had, however, Dr. Physick and myself been inclined to promote Mr. Pattison's election, we could not have done it. Two of the Trustees of our College, about the first of May, waited on Dr. Physick, who was still confined to his room by illness, to inform him, that they had resolved to make an appointment, and that it was the opinion of a large majority of the Board, that the interest of the school imperatively required, he should be transferred to the Anatomical chair, in consequence of which strong representation, he acquiesced, though very reluctantly, in the measure.

All the testimonials, however, in favour of Mr. Pattison, in our possession, had been laid before the trustees—he was caused regularly to be nominated,—and in every respect entire justice was done to his pretensions.*

* The letter of Dr. Dewees I have now seen, and find it to be precisely of the purport above stated. What relates to the subject, is in the following words. "As far then, as a firm belief that you would succeed (and that belief founded on pretty certain data) will offer an inducement to pay us a visit, I have no hesitation to declare, that no question remains in my mind, *that*

Before his arrival, the election was over, of which he is apprised by Professor Hare, on his landing at New-York—to whom, instead of expressing disappointment, or uttering a complaint, he remarks, that the *main motive of his visit*

were you on the spot, your election would be certain. It is unquestionably the opinion of two of the most influential and best informed men here. Your visit should be as prompt as possible, that you might have the necessary time for the preparatory arrangements here. My opportunities to judge of the sentiments of those, who have this gift in their power, will be best explained by your brother."

In commenting on this document, I must in the first place, again disclaim for myself, as well as for Dr. Physick, by whom I am instructed to do so, all knowledge *of its having been written, much less that it was authorised by us*. It is within our recollection, that about the date of it, we did entertain and express the opinion to Dr. Dewees, without however knowing that he would act on it in this way, that if Mr. Pattison *were present*, and *realized* the extraordinary *representations of his friends*, he might succeed. To this conviction we were led by the circumstance that the Trustees after postponing the appointment for six months, from a disinclination to choose any one of the candidates then in nomination, had publicly advertised that they would receive applications from any quarter. But we soon discovered our mistake,—for at their first meeting, which took place not many days afterwards, when all the testimonials of Mr. Pattison were submitted to them, so far from a favourable impression being made, these recommendations were treated contemptuously, as extravagant and hyperbolical,—it being quite manifest, that no individual with half the merit which they set forth, would sacrifice his actual possessions, to embark in so adventurous a scheme! Of this, Mr. John Pattison was told by myself, and with a view of soothing his feelings, which seemed to be deeply wounded, I well remember adding, that he ought not to be mortified at the rejection of his brother's claims, since, on a former occasion, owing to local influence and partialities, Dr. Augustine J. Smith, with the highest

to this country was to see his brother and family, and that he should speedily return. Exactly the same language he holds to Dr. Physick, Dr. Dewees, Dr. Horner and myself on his reaching this city. Not a whisper of reproach escapes him,

possible reputation, supported too by the united voice of the Medical Faculty, had been put aside.

Most solemnly do I declare, that in no one instance, did I ever afford Mr. John Pattison the slightest encouragement. This Dr. Dewees tells me, *he uniformly acknowledged to him—often expressed his concern at the circumstance—was suspicious that I was not friendly to his brother, and conjured him to endeavour to enlist me in his interests!!!*

No promise was obtained, or even directly asked of Dr. Physick or myself, to support his brother. Why was Mr. John Pattison content with the representation only of Dr. Dewees? Did he not know that he had no connexion with the college, and that the trustees, consisting of twenty-four individuals of the highest rank and consideration, are no more to be dictated to, or controlled by any, or the whole of the medical professors, than the Autocrat of all the Russias? Was he not habitually with Mr. Chauncey on this subject, who was either a trustee himself at the time, or so intimately acquainted with many of that board, as to afford him the most authentic information of their views and dispositions. Expressly, indeed, does he declare, that throughout the affair he should be governed by the advice of that gentleman.*

As to the state of the profession at the time, in this city, in relation to surgical skill, the profits of practice, or the emoluments of a professorship, it will be seen, that the information and advice which I gave him in these several respects, corresponds exactly with what he received from Mr. Chauncey, whose opinions he pronounces to be "all wisdom," and in whom of course, he reposed implicit confidence.†

The fact is, that on finding we could not carry Dr. Smith, the

* Vide Mr. Pattison's pamphlet.

† Vide p. 24, 25, 26 and 27 of Mr. G. S. Pattison's pamphlet, containing the Letter of Mr. John Pattison.

even at the subsequent period, when he found Dr. Physick and myself strenuously supporting Dr. Gibson in opposition to him for the chair of Surgery. On the contrary, he says to Dr. Physick, *you have held out to me no promises, and*

efforts of Dr. Physick and myself were directed to the election of Dr. Warren of Boston. Of Mr. Pattison, we never thought for a single moment—in proof of which, I appeal to our faculty, whether, at any of our meetings, and to the trustees, with some of whom we had daily interviews and conferences, the name of that person was ever mentioned in relation to the subject.

His coming hither was, indeed, a matter of such extreme uncertainty, that whatever value we might have attached to his talents as represented to us, we could not at all calculate on him: and without his being present, we knew there was not the slightest chance of his success. This he unguardedly confesses I told him at one of our earliest meetings.*

Can it be credited, that Dr. Physick, Dr. Dewees, and myself, are so profligate, for such is the amount of the charge, as to have conspired to import Mr. Granville Sharpe Pattison, merely for the purpose of breaking up his establishment at home, and then, after detaining him here, for a time, by a series of delusive kindness, to have commenced a system of the most malignant persecution to effect his ruin !!!

We are accused of having tantalized him with expectations by which he was prevented from returning home. It is equally false. He was told, on all and every occasion, that the door was closed against him in the University till a vacancy should occur. The only proposition which we ever made to him was to unite with Dr. Horner, as a teacher of practical anatomy, to which the latter gentleman would not accede, from having detected Mr. Pattison in a pitiful attempt to supplant him as Dissector. Never, for a single moment, was the thought entertained of a junction with Dr. Gibson in the surgical chair—and here occurs one of those contradictions in the statements of Mr. Pattison, which it is so difficult to avoid where there is an

* Vide Mr. Pattison's pamphlet, p. 9.

therefore I have no claims on you. On this point I speak positively, and with the *express authority* of Dr. Physick.

He further declares to us and many others, that he is

utter want of veracity. He allows his willingness to coalesce with Dr. Gibson, and in almost the same page holds the following language in reference to a proposal which, he says, was made to him to become the associate of Dr. Horner:

"My answer was, that I never would come into that or any other University, unless as an independent professor, with powers and privileges equal to those possessed by my colleagues. That one man was, if qualified by abilities and education, equal to any professorship. If Dr. Horner's acquirements fitted him for the delivery of a part of the lectures, he must be qualified for giving the whole; and that if he had not talents which qualified him to become the single professor, it was certainly neither for my interest nor for the interest of the University, that such an association should be formed. I therefore begged that the proposal might be considered as refused."*

I will only add, in dismissing this subject, that Mr. Pattison was now on the spot, and had the most ample opportunities of ascertaining with the utmost precision, what could be effected for him, and on what he was to rely. He had seen that the whole influence of Dr. Physick and myself, backed by the strongest recommendations, could barely elect Dr. Gibson, who had also the advantages of having an established reputation among us, of being a native, and personally known to many of the trustees. The point, indeed, had been absolutely settled. Not long after the election of Dr. Gibson, at the request of Mr. Pattison, Dr. Physick and myself called on Mr. Binney and Mr. Meredith, two of the trustees, to ascertain whether their board had, at a recent meeting, expressed a desire to make a provision for him; to which they replied, certainly not, and never would, till he became a citizen of the United States, and afforded the evidence of his pretensions, which is derived from personal knowledge.

Though this was communicated to him, and we supposed

* Vide pages 10 and 14, of his pamphlet.

very indifferent as to the event, meaning to go to London, where he has the most brilliant prospects of professional success, and solicits Dr. Horner to accompany him on an excursion to Canada, whence he is to sail for England.

The first intimation I had of his design to remain in this country, was given in a conference with me, on the expediency of his accepting an offer of fifteen hundred dollars from the college of Lexington, to teach Anatomy. The offer is declined, not however, till the appointment is formally made, and extracts from the whole of his letters of introduction, are published in the western papers.*

would be final, some evenings afterwards, in the presence of several individuals, at the house of Dr. Dewees, one of his most intimate friends again renewed the subject, by inquiring of me, whether a chair could not be created for Mr. Pattison, combining physiology, with minute and morbid anatomy? To this I distinctly replied, and begged that it might so be told him, that I would not make another effort—that I considered the opinion of the trustees as decisive in regard to him—and that, moreover, such a proposition seemed to clash with the claims of Dr. Horner, which in every view I held to be paramount. The persons present, among whom is Dr. Dewees, have a clear recollection of this circumstance—and the more so, they inform me, from Mr. Pattison's friend bursting into tears, on finding an extinction to all his hopes—lamenting his pecuniary distresses, &c.

* With the cold indifference to truth for which he is so conspicuous, Mr. Pattison here makes a statement entirely false. "The trustees," says he, "of the University of Lexington did me the honour to elect me, *without my knowledge*, sometime in the *latter* end of September." P. 44. Directly in contradiction to this, President Holley, in a circular letter of October *the 8th*, publishes, "That our medical school will open on the second Monday in November next. Dr. Caldwell has informed us, that Dr. *Pattison*, Dr. Brown, and himself, will certainly be here by the first day of the month."

Now the fact is, that the application was duly made through

Now commences the distinguished kindness, or as he is pleased to term it, the persecution of Dr. Physick and myself. The masquerade dress which hitherto had enveloped him, he throws off—approaches us in proper person, avows his pecuniary distresses,—unfolds his views,—and solicits our patronage.

As the result of our best judgment, we discourage him from settling in Philadelphia—urge his return to London—or if determined to continue in America, to select Baltimore as a residence, having an opening both in the Medical School, and in the practice of Surgery, created by the removal of Dr. Gibson, *and letters of introduction are solicited by me, from this gentleman, for the purpose.** But he decides otherwise—establishes himself in this city—and henceforward is introduced into business by Dr. Physick—consulted in some difficult cases—is invited by him to operate before an assemblage of medical men to display his skill—has a letter backed by our joint recommendation to the Trustees, to allow him accommodation for his Museum—we endeavour to get him the privilege of lecturing in some apartment of the University,—and attend his introductory lecture, to manifest unequivocally to the students our friendly disposition for the success of his course.

Yet, all this did not satisfy him, and in proportion as we conceded, was the increase of his demands. To be appoint-

Dr. Caldwell, who was furnished with all his documents, with a distinct understanding, that in the event of his election, he, Mr. Pattison, would accept. The college were, moreover, as I am told, justly indignant at the disrespectful manner in which they were treated, considering the only motive of Mr. Pattison in procuring the appointment, was to have it published as an early recognition of his consequence in this country.

* This, which has never been denied, looks very much like the jealousy with which we have been insolently charged.

ed the adjunct of Dr. Physick, or to have phvsiologv detached from me, and united with morbid and minute anatomy, as a separate professorship, was the *sine qua non*, the last of his very reasonable demands.

It was in vain, we urged the inadmissibility of such arrangements—that they were improper in themselves—that the Trustees would never appoint so recent a foreigner to any place—that he must become a citizen—ratify his claims by longer residence and more intimate acquaintance—keep quiet—entangle himself with no medical party—engage in no dispute, and we would guarantee his ultimate success.

After this, we had little intercourse with him. He seemed to be soured, gradually alienated himself from us, began a system of hostility to the school and personal detraction of the professors, and was as insolent in his general demeanor, as he had previously been humble, laudatory, and submissive.

At this period, the letter of Dr. Dewees and the attendant accusations came forth, not manfully presented as a just grievance, calling for explanation and redress, but in vague and untangible rumours. Neither the one nor the other was previously signified to Dr. Physick or myself, or even the slightest dissatisfaction expressed.*

* The first intimation I had of the existence of the letter was in January, many months after the arrival of Mr. Pattison. It was given to me by a friend in the presence of a large company, of whom Dr. Dewees was one. I immediately asked him, in the hearing of all, whether such a letter had been written by my instructions, or with my knowledge, to which he answered in the negative. This was told the very next morning to the Pattisons. Not long afterwards we fully ascertained that these men, while living in habits of the closest intimacy with Dr. Dewees, partaking of his hospitalities, and with every profession of friendship and good will towards him, had diligently circu-

He had spoken of us at all times as his kindest benefactors, and so late as the evening on which he delivered his introductory lecture, the 1st of November, he took me by the hand, in the presence of Dr. Dewees, and several other gentlemen, and thanked me, and through me Dr. Physick, for our liberal and magnanimous conduct towards him.

In a short time his character was pretty well evolved, and we could not forbear to inquire into the validity of the grounds on which our early prepossessions rested. It appeared, in the first place, that the account which he had given us of the affair with Mrs. Ure, was so much distorted, as hardly to retain any of the facts. As this, however, is a matter of leading importance, I shall be more precise.

Mr. Pattison, on hearing that the story of his amour had reached Philadelphia, convened Dr. Physick, Dr. Dewees, and myself, for the purpose of reading to us an elaborate printed pamphlet, containing his defence, on the conclusion of which, he requested, that if convinced of his innocence, we would give him a certificate to that effect. Though probably none of us doubted it—such was our confidence in the veracity of his statements, supported by the respectability of his recommendations—we declined doing it, and advised his submitting the case to Mr. Binney, or some other eminent legal character, for an opinion, as calculated to produce a much stronger effect on the public mind.

Not long afterwards, he tells me, with much apparent satisfaction, that Mr. Binney had decided in his favour, and requested me to communicate it to Dr. Physick, which I accordingly did. Being widely diffused, this report served very much to repress the force of the accusation, and was only contradicted a month or two ago, by a declaration

lated in secret, copies of his letter, to show that he was either the tool of Dr. Physick and myself, or had officiously intermeddled in the concerns of the University!

from Mr. Binney to me, that he had never been at all consulted in the case.* He had previously told Dr. Physick, that Mr. Chauncey had delivered a similar opinion. Whether it be true, I am unable to ascertain. Mr. Chauncey having recently been professionally consulted by Mr. Pattison, considerations of delicacy forbid any application to him on the subject.

Nor is this the only deception which he practised. A letter declared by him to be from Dr. Ure to his wife, was read to us, to demonstrate the iniquity of their character, of a description so execrably obscene, that I dare not cite even a single passage, or allude more distinctly to its contents. This letter, I have since understood, was not exhibited on the trial, makes no part of the record, and the presumption is strong, and more particularly as it proves to be *anonymous*, that it is a mere fabrication.†

* This is positively denied by Mr. Pattison. But both Mr. Walsh and Mr. Peters recollect, that some time after my separation from him, being asked, what I thought of his guilt, I replied, that having heard from him that Mr. Binney had pronounced his innocence, I was bound to believe it. That Mr Chauncey, such is my confidence in the integrity, and profound respect for the judgment of that eminent lawyer, should give an opinion on a statement purely ex parte, seems to me so improbable, that I suspect here, too, Mr. Pattison is guilty of a falsehood.

† As stated, the letter does not appear among the official documents. Though from its detestably indelicate nature, I should wish to pass it over, I am not now permitted to do so, on account of the great importance which has been given to it. The letter, it will be perceived, I had pronounced to be a fabrication, and to this conclusion I was led from the character of its contents, which was confirmed by the lame and improbable explanation of the mode in which it was procured.

The letter apprises his wife of his knowledge of her amours at Edinburgh, and approves of her continuing in this course of in-

What is the precise standing of Dr. Ure in Glasgow, or how it was affected by this public event, I have no means of accurately determining. But it is not true, as averred by Mr. Pattison, that covered with disgrace, he was expelled

famy, provided she takes care not to add to his family. These atrocious sentiments are clothed in language, and brought out in such gross relief, as can only be imagined by one educated in stews, and conversant with the slang of these scenes of unmitigated moral depravity and personal abasement. Now I challenge the whole records of vice for a parallel case. Where is the husband to write such a letter? Where is the wife to receive it? To the human heart, by which we are never deceived, I appeal on the occasion, and ask whether it does not turn from the charge with loathing and disgust, as a fabrication of unheard-of baseness and turpitude!

To render this transaction completely infamous, only one thing more was required, and even that is supplied. When interrogated by Dr. Physick, who was shocked at the letter, how it came into his hands, Mr. Pattison replies, that Mrs. Ure "goes to my lawyer and tells him, I have in my possession a paper which will ruin Ure, and I will give it up to you on certain terms." What are the terms? There is no way in which I can communicate the expression used on this occasion, without an unpardonable outrage on public morals. At one time I meditated resorting for the purpose to the obscurities of a learned language—but in vain! I sought even in the histories of the worst times of the corruptions of ancient society, for epithets of adequate obscenity to convey the sense.

The reader will bear in mind, that Mr. Jeffrey, the accomplished editor of the Edinburgh Review, was the acknowledged lawyer of Mr. Pattison on this occasion !!!

The silence of Dr. Ure, says Mr. Pattison, on the subject of this letter, during my continuance in Scotland, and the suppression of his work containing it, after it was printed, is a tacit acknowledgment of the genuineness of the letter. What was the motive of Dr. Ure to this step, I have no exact intelligence. But I remember well, the great uneasiness which Mr. Pattison expres-

from the city. I find from the periodical journals, that he continues to be in full communion with the scientific men abroad—retains his professorship—and that within the present year, he was honoured by the attendance of a large collection of the most eminent citizens, at a lecture in which he displayed his splendid experiments in galvanism.

That nothing appeared to his prejudice on the memorable trial, we have a right to infer from the fact of the divorce having been granted, as it is the established practice of the British courts of law, to withhold such relief, where the parties are equally culpable. Even Majesty itself, we have recently seen, has been compelled to yield to this imperative dictate of justice, and inexorable usage *

sed to Dr. Dewees and myself, on seeing an advertisement of the work in a Glasgow paper, and his subsequent satisfaction on telling me, that the edition had been cancelled, at the intreaty of the friends of Mrs. Ure, to prevent a more public exposure of the filthy affair. If, as Mr. Pattison says, Dr. Ure did it in consequence of "one of the actors, who had granted a false declaration, coming before the public and making a confession, that it was destitute of truth, and a statement of all the means, bribes, threats, &c. which had been employed to obtain it," why is not the name of this important personage given, as well as all the circumstances of the case?

Why, as the letter was so generally, as he says, admitted to be Dr. Ure's, in Glasgow, have we not indisputable evidence of it? Where, I finally demand, is the certificate of Mr. Jeffrey, who is said to have procured the letter.

Either Dr. Ure or Mr. Pattison is the most consummate villain in existence. The one or the other wrote the letter in question. The latter is found in possession of it, and let him show how he got it.

* No small pains are taken by Mr. Pattison to exhibit Dr. Ure in the most odious light, and for this purpose, various circumstances are related with great particularity. Be his character as black as it is represented, what is to be deduced from it in the

Though not directly connected with my subject, it is perhaps right, that I should say a word or two in reference to Mr. Pattison's boasted discovery, since my name has, and will probably be still more, brought into discussion. Two

present case, I do not perceive. The conviction in the trial for adultery was not on his evidence, and hence, whether he be vicious or otherwise, is wholly aside of the subject. It is not to vindicate him, for I know him not, that he is here introduced, though I must state that my inquiries about him have ended decidedly to his advantage, and that I do deliberately believe he is most injured and abused. Be this however as it may, Mr. Pattison has been guilty of some of the most abominable falsehoods concerning him, which it is my intention now to shew.

It appears as above, that he was at first described by Mr. Pattison, in consequence of the affair of the Divorce, as a ruined man, degraded from his station, exiled from his home, and every where an object of contempt or execration. To Dr. Physick, Dr. Dewees, myself and others, this was repeatedly told. Contrary however, to what he then said, it is now confessed that Dr. Ure still holds his professorship, though the reason assigned for it is the peculiar nature of the tenure by which a removal is prevented. "The Andersonian Institution, (says Mr. Pattison,) of which Dr. Ure is a member, is an *establishment of late date*. The funds which were obtained for the erection of its buildings were procured by subscription, and as Dr. Ure was very active at the time when the money was raised, in obtaining it, and granted to the subscribers of 20*l.* a perpetual ticket of admission, to one of his courses of lectures, it has become a question, whether the money given was bestowed on him as an individual, he granting personally an equivalent, or to the corporation of the Institution. When Dr. Ure, about six years ago, *fraudulently stole his father's will* for the purpose of defrauding his family, an attempt was made to expel him from the Institution; but as the trustees, upon taking advice, learnt that his expulsion would involve them in a tedious litigation, a litigation which would be required to be carried on by money, advanced by them as individuals, the attempt was abandoned, and as he now is a despised and ne-

or three months ago, I gave to Dr. Gibson a certificate, stating that Mr. Pattison had acknowledged to me his familiar acquaintance with Colles' book, and that the fascia therein described, differed essentially from the one claimed

glected character, he was permitted to continue connected with the Institution. The tenure by which he holds his appointment, and which prevented his expulsion in the former instance, has in the present, permitted him still to continue in office."*

No one can read the above extract without being struck with the awkwardness of its construction, and the improbability of its statements. Whether there is a foundation for any part of it, is very questionable. That the Andersonian Institution is not of a *late date*, I have most satisfactorily ascertained. Consulting a work, entitled, "A Picture of Glasgow," I find the following account:

"The Institution was incorporated on June 9th, 1796, by charter from the magistrates of the city. It was *established* by the late Mr. *John Anderson*, Professor of Natural Philosophy in the *University*, who for that purpose, by his will, endowed it with his valuable philosophical apparatus, museum, and library." The account goes on to state, that Dr. Ure is the *present* incumbent of the Philosophical chair, and that his predecessors were Drs. Garnett and Birbeck.

As to the affair of *the will*, I have no knowledge. In itself, it carries little credibility, is sustained by no direct, and is confuted by very strong presumptive evidence. We are told, indeed, by Mr. Pattison, that a Mr. Graham writes, we know not to whom, that "Dr. Ure was only saved from Botany Bay for fraudulently stealing his father's will." The question immediately occurs, how could he be saved except by an acquittal of the charge? Exactly in the same way, and probably with much more truth, might it be averred, that Mr. Pattison was only saved from the same destination, and that he now appears as an "acquitted felon."

The affair to which I allude, requires one word of explanation. Not long before he came to this country, Mr. Pattison

* Pages 47 and 48 of Mr. P.'s pamphlet.

by himself, as he would show when he entered on his dissections.

At this, I understand, he was greatly provoked, and has accused me of misrepresentation. In reply, I will repeat,

was tried for a felony, in stealing a body from the grave. It was that of Mrs. M'Callister, a lady of distinction, who died of a disease that excited his curiosity. The friends, however, getting intelligence of it, went to his theatre, and demanded the corpse, which he denied having, under solemn protestations, and closed the doors against their admission. But these were broken open, and they found that during the interval he had been busily engaged in mangling and disfiguring the face, so that it might not be recognized. This account was, some months ago, given by a Scotch gentleman of character, to General Cadwalader and myself, and I have since had it confirmed from other sources, with this addition, that Mr. Pattison merely escaped from the want of evidence that he had taken the clothes of the deceased: the part of the offence most penal under the Scotch law.

In every view, it is most ungracious in Mr. Pattison, to bring forward, at this late hour, such a charge against his quondam friend and colleague. It is in evidence that the greatest intimacy prevailed between them, that he was domesticated in the family of Dr. Ure, and by his own acknowledgment, that up to the unfortunate affair, he experienced "the most attentive and flattering demeanour" from him. See Mr. Pattison's pamphlet, p. 37.

That Dr. Ure is at present much regarded by the scientific men of Europe, we have the most satisfactory evidence. The contributions from him to the journals are numerous, and his correspondence seems to be eagerly sought. He has, within a few months, published a Dictionary of Chemistry, which is highly commended by the reviewers, with allusions to him personally, as a man of great consideration and standing. Those who have doubts on the subject, may consult the late numbers of Tilloch's Philosophical Magazine, and Brand's Journal of the Royal Institution. What, however, is still more conclusive, is

that I have a most distinct recollection of the fact—having often mentioned it, and that I am borne out by the testimony of Dr. Hays and Dr. Edward Barton, who heard him, on another occasion, avow his having read the book previously to his coming to this country.

There is, however, some circumstantial proof, which, while it sustains me, convicts him of a deliberate attempt in another instance to impose on us, and through us, the medical public of this country.

That he claimed the discovery of the fascia when he first

a passage in the dedication of this work to the Earl of Glasgow, from which it appears, that he enjoys the patronage and most friendly countenance of that eminent personage.

"At my outset in life," says he, "your Lordship's distinguished favour cherished those studious pursuits, which have since formed my chief pleasure and business; and to your Lordship's *hospitality, I owe the elegant retirement* in which many of the following pages were written, &c." Turning to the biography of this nobleman, I find, that he has been created an English peer—that he is Lord Lieutenant of the county of Ayr, and *Regent of the University of Glasgow*, and in short, is one of the most learned and in every respect distinguished of the peerage.

Living on the spot, and closely connected with the College, he must, of course, have known all that had happened in regard to Dr. Ure. But instead of casting him off, as we might suppose from the representations of Mr. Pattison, he gives him the strongest mark of confidence and attachment, by domesticating him in his family.

What, however, is absolutely conclusive of the pure and elevated standing of Dr. Ure, is his recent election as a *Fellow of the Royal Society of London*—the most enviable honor undoubtedly, which a man of science can receive.

The falsehoods of Mr. Pattison in this case, are aggravated by the basest ingratitude. To Dr. Ure he was indebted for much kindness, and especially, as I understand, for his appointment to the Andersonian Institution.

arrived among us, and has been compelled to relinquish it to Mr. Colles, is not denied.

Can it be credited, that any man in the position of Mr. Pattison, supposing himself the author of a discovery curious in itself, and of the highest practical import, for such he has proclaimed it, would not have consulted, and even diligently scrutinized all the authorities on the subject, and particularly the treatise of an eminent professor in a neighbouring college, on the very structure involving it? Why, too, was it not published in Europe? Certainly he has shown none of that sensibility which diffidently shrinks from the press. Nor can we refrain from inquiring why the great European anatomists, Mr. Cooper, and Dr. Thompson, and Dr. Barclay, before whom he tells us he made the demonstration, and received an explicit recognition of his title to the discovery, have not alluded to it in their letters of introduction? Would they, I finally demand, have omitted so important an incident in the estimate of his character and pretensions? At all events Mr. Pattison is hung on the horns of a dilemma from which he cannot extricate himself. Conceding that Cooper, and Barclay, and Thompson and Dupuytren, did really confess the fascia to be a structure, prior to the illustration of Mr. Pattison, unknown to them, what becomes of the charge of ignorance which he has arrogantly cast on Dr. Physick and the rest of the anatomists of this country relative to the subject? *

* It was the detection of this fraud, that brought on the controversy between Dr. Gibson and Mr. Pattison, out of which arose all the subsequent altercations. Totally unable to sustain himself, he is silent on this point, in his reply to me, and is content that the alleged discovery shall be considered as it now is, a piece of imposture, originating in falsehood, advanced with effrontery, and finally abandoned in disgrace.

The European critics seem to entertain pretty nearly the same

The character and conduct of Mr. Pattison, I have now, perhaps, placed in sufficient relief before the public. It may possibly be asked, how Dr. Physick and myself came to countenance an individual of this description. The answer is plain, and can be given in one word. Confiding in the re-

views of the subject. It was only to-day I had put into my hands a number of the London Quarterly Journal of Foreign Medicine and Surgery, a work of the highest authority, containing an elaborate notice of Mr. Pattison's controversial writings with Dr. Gibson, in which his claim to a discovery is treated with contempt, and the practical deductions from it represented to be utterly false—with some very strong insinuations of his want of candour and integrity in the affair.

Mr. Shaw, a distinguished Surgeon of London, and the partner of Mr. Charles Bell, avows himself to be the author of the article.

By a gentleman lately returned from Europe, I am told, that both Mr. Dupuytren, and Mr. Cooper utterly deny ever having acknowledged to Mr. Pattison, that he had made any discovery. The latter gentleman declares that he never saw him, except on one occasion, and disclaims all acquaintance with him! Yet his intimacy with Mr. Cooper was the constant boast of Mr. Pattison, and he actually refers to him in his writings, as his illustrious friend, &c.

In the same spirit and with similar motives, he told Dr. Physick, Dr. Dewees, and many other of the physicians of this city on his first arrival, that he had read for membership, before the Medical Society of Emulation in Paris, the history of several new and difficult operations which he had performed, with which they were so much delighted, that waiving all the ordinary forms he was immediately elected by acclamation. Now from the proceedings of that society in my possession, it appears, that so far from this being true, they appointed a committee to report on the communication, who condemn in the harshest terms the operations, as betraying gross diagnostic inaccuracies, and practical temerity—insisting on it, that they were done in opposition to all established principles and authority in surgery.

commendatory letters of our friends, and his own plausible statements, we believed him guiltless of the imputed charges, and considered him, as doubtless many very honest people in Baltimore now do, cruelly persecuted.

It was only within a short period I have discovered, that the whole of the letters from *Scotland*, to Dr. Physick and myself, are of a date anterior to the *criminal affair*—and still more recently, I have had reasons to believe, that the writers of some of those letters have expressed their regret at giving them to a person who had proved so unworthy. Certain it is, and I make the statement, on the authority of two most respectable men who have lately returned from Glasgow, that Mr. Pattison is generally condemned in that city, and that it was spoken of every where, as a matter of astonishment, that he should have been so readily received into the society of this country.*

* The letters in question, are from the Rev. Dr. Chalmers, of Glasgow, author of the well-known splendid sermons, and Dr. King, of the same city. The former writes to Dr. Mason of New-York, as follows:

"I lately wrote you, in behalf of Mr. Pattison, of this place, for a vacant chair in the college of Philadelphia. There has since broke out upon the public ear a *most disagreeable story* of a *criminal intercourse* between him and a *married lady*, in this place. I have received a letter from himself, upon this subject, in which, without owning his intercourse, he asks me to suspend my judgment. I have since written to him to *suspend* the use of my recommendations; and in case *you should have said or done any thing in consequence of what I wrote you on his account, I leave you to counteract or modify it, in any way you think proper.*"

"P. S. Forgive the trouble I put you to, on account of Mr. Pattison. I wrote his recommendations under the *heavy disadvantage* of an entire ignorance of the subject, which became public some weeks ago, but I deem it altogether fair to yourself and the College of Philadelphia, to forward this communication."

The object of this address I hope will not be misunderstood. It is not to vindicate the alleged refusal to meet Mr. Pattison. Even if I had received a formal challenge, which I never did, as appears from the correspondence, and how-

But, says Mr. Pattison, "this letter must have been written before I came before the public with a refutation of the charges against me, and consequently cannot, in the slightest degree, be considered as militating against my character.* It appears that the refutation came out early in March,† and Mr. Pattison left England on the 30th of June, so that a period of three months elapsed, without any change of sentiment on the part of Dr. Chalmers, or, at least, any acknowledgment of it. Can it indeed be supposed, had such a change taken place, he would not, from a sense of justice, independently of other motives not less operative, hastened to have made the communication. Two years, however, have elapsed, and not a word is heard on the subject.

Exactly the same course is pursued by Dr. King, another of his friends. As soon as the affair transpires, he writes to Mr. Stevenson, a correspondent in this city, expressing his deep regret at the conduct of Mr. Pattison, and the necessity of his revoking former recommendations. What, says he, is particularly culpable in his conduct, is the obstinate denial of his guilt against irresistible evidence, aggravating crime by falsehood.

By the absence of Mr. Stevenson, I have not been able to procure this letter for publication. But I have given its contents as represented to me by several intelligent individuals, by whom it has been carefully read. *Two* of the *three* gentlemen of Glasgow, who gave Mr. Pattison letters, have, therefore recalled them, and be it remembered, that each of these, has been claimed by him, as a most intimate and particular friend. There are many persons in this city, who have heard Mr. Pattison boast of the affectionate devotion of Dr. Chalmers to him, and in the first of his controversional writings in the Recorder, he incidentally notices the friendship of Dr. King.

* Vide Mr. Pattison's pamphlet, p. 49.
† Vide Mr. Walker's letter.

ever pure his character might have been, I should have at once declined it. The disparity of our age, the inequality of our condition in society, the claims of a numerous family, and the obligation imposed by my public station, must have dictated this decision. It really would seem to me, under any circumstances, not quite fit to have introduced my course of lectures, with the spectacle of a duel. The parents and friends of the several hundred young men confided to my care, require of

The reader who may be in possession of Mr. Pattison's pamphlet, I wish particularly to notice the account he gives of the contents of Dr. Chalmers' letter, and also the mode in which he says I obtained it. The fact is, Dr. Mason, who had been a patient of mine, calling on me to report the state of his health, incidentally mentioned, in the course of conversation, that he had such a letter, and as the design of writing it was to counteract a previous recommendatory one, he had no objection to give it to me, to be used as I might think proper. He was then on his way to Baltimore, where he is visited by Mr. Pattison, who begs that the letter may not be delivered to me, at all events, till the appearance of his defence, when he hoped that he would be so convinced of his innocence, as to withhold it altogether. For the correctness of this statement, I appeal to Dr. Mason.

Disregarding the most imperative injunctions, the above letters are continued to be employed by Mr. Pattison, and especially to support his application for the professorship of anatomy in the College of Lexington. In a newspaper of that city, now before me, there is a circular letter from President Holley, announcing the election of Mr. Pattison, accompanied with a display of his documents, among which are *these very letters*—and this fraud, so abominable in itself, is heightened by a deliberate falsehood. "The notarial copy of his letter," says he, meaning Dr. King's, "*I have not used:*"* and, in relation to that of Dr. Chalmers, he makes the same sort of denial. Much credit, however, he assumes for having, previously to his quarrel with me, mentioned to Dr. McDowell and Revere of Baltimore, his

* Vide Mr. Pattison's pamphlet.

me very different things—and assuredly, had I yielded on this occasion, I should have had to encounter the heaviest censure, and perhaps a more decisive step from those discreet and elevated men, under whom I have the honour to hold my appointment. With Mr. Pattison it is entirely different. He is an adventurer with a tainted reputation, which he hoped to repair. What has he to lose? and to ruin the happiness of a family, we have already seen is one of his sports. Yet from his manner of receiving Dr. Horner's communication, there would appear to be some method in his madness, and Bobadil like, he displays his valour only, where there is no possibility of danger.*

particular and most confidential friends, the correspondence between Dr. Chalmers and himself. Why, it may here be asked, if he were really actuated in this instance by a spirit of candour, did he not make the disclosure general? or was it delayed to the last moment? and how happened it that he used the letter at all? The true cause of the disclosure is well known. Early in the autumn, one of the professors of the school of Baltimore, with another distinguished medical man, arrived from Scotland, with full intelligence relative to Mr. Pattison, and among other matters of which they spoke, told here and in Baltimore of the recall of the letters. This disclosure produced great alarm, and then it was, in agony of heart, he makes the precious confession.

* It cannot have escaped the recollection of the reader of Mr. Pattison's pamphlet, how artfully he attempts to fix on me the imputation of a professed duellist, and of a turbulent and sanguinary spirit, and for this purpose particularly, relates, much in detail, a story, as he is pleased to term it, of my advising Dr. Gibson, in his presence, to resort to this practice, which I had found so efficacious in silencing hostility—" to blow out the brains of his opponents," &c. &c. On the appearance of his publication, Dr. Gibson wrote to me to the following effect, which I am induced to lay before the public, as furnishing further, and the strongest proof, of Mr. Pattison's total want of veracity.

I have now done with Mr. Pattison. Of the public, I sincerely beg pardon for obtruding on them such a communication. An appeal of this sort, I sensibly feel is most derogatory, and I have long avoided it. Perhaps it was now unnecessary. Encouraged, however, by our forbearance, there seemed to be no end to the calumnies and misrepresentations, raised by Mr. Pattison and his auxiliaries, at the expense of Dr. Physick and myself. As a private individual, we knew his insignificance, and despised his malicious endeavours. Elevated however as he is, to a most respectable station, and sustained by the influence which it confers, it was thought, that he had acquired some importance, and that the public mind should be enlightened as to his character and machinations. N. CHAPMAN.

Philadelphia, Nov. 5, 1820.

P. S. It would really seem impossible for Mr. Pattison, on any occasion to adhere to the truth. An impression has gone abroad, and is now made the subject of a paragraph in

" You *did not* propose to me a *junction* with *Mr. Pattison*, in the *Chair of Surgery*—nor did I offer to divide its duties, or *even converse* with him on the subject. The supper, of which he speaks, was not given '*on my election*,' but three days before, and was not to *me*, but to *Mr. Pattison*, as Dr. M'Clellan will prove.

" Mr. Pattison parted from us on leaving Dr. M'Clellan's door. We did not *walk round Washington Square*. The story about 'blowing out brains,' and so forth, is *throughout a fabrication*. Your advice, on the contrary, to me, was to endeavour to conciliate the medical men of the city, by a uniform course of civility and mildness, &c. &c."

Equally unfounded is the charge of my having challenged, in the Medical Society, a respectable member of the Society of Friends. To prevent a detection of this falsehood, no individual is named. But subsequently it is confessed, that the allusion was

the Baltimore papers—doubtless originating with, or sanctioned by him—that the prosecution against him for sending the alleged challenge, was instigated by myself and some others of the medical faculty, with the hope of detaining him here, to the injury of the school to which he belongs.

Twice did Mr. Biddle in open court, and once to Mr. Chauncey, *in the presence of Mr. Pattison*, declare, that the prosecution was his own act, in which I or others had no concern, directly or indirectly, and for which he assumed the entire responsibility. Nor is Mr. Pattison ignorant, that when Mr. S. F. Bradford, with the best intentions, voluntarily called on me, on the night of the arrest, to ask my interference for the suppression of the legal proceeding, I at once expressed my willingness to do so, if any mode could be pointed out to effect it, and that I gave assurance at the same time, in the event of the conviction of Mr. Pattison, I would instantly in person apply to the executive for his pardon.

to Dr. Parrish. My friend Dr. Harris, without my knowledge on hearing of this, called on that gentleman, to inquire into the matter, and received from him a positive contradiction of the tale.

Concerning the affair with Dr. Dewees, I shall only observe, that it happened fifteen or sixteen years ago—and if my conduct was reprehensible, I hope I have since atoned for it, by a friendship warm, cordial and sincere. What, however, will be thought of the malignity of a man, who thus endeavours to disturb the happiness of families, by references of this nature !!!

CASE OF DIVORCE

OF

ANDREW URE, M. D. v. *CATHARINE URE.*

PREFACE.

CONSIDERING it wholly unsuited to my character and station to maintain, on any terms, a controversy with Mr. Pattison, I at once resolved, on the appearance of his publication against me, as a summary mode of ending it, to procure, though I was in possession of all the material facts, in order to remove every pretext for cavil or disputation, an official transcript of the documents in the affair of Mrs. Ure. The entire proceedings of the Court, duly authenticated, which convicted that unhappy lady of an adulterous intercourse with Granville Sharpe Pattison, being received, I have caused the same to be faithfully printed for distribution. But previously to taking this step, the papers were submitted to three of our eminent lawyers, who, after a careful examination, have pronounced the chain of evidence to be without a flaw, and it is deemed, by them, in every respect, sound, complete, and satisfactory. The question, therefore, may now be decided, whether I am, as I have been represented, the wanton calumniator of the reputation of an innocent and honourable man, or whether he is not, as I have alleged, the most atrocious malefactor in his particular line, who, driven from his native land, has ever sought refuge among us.

It will be perceived, that the charge which I preferred against him is fully sustained by the solemn adjudication of a tribunal regularly constituted—impeached neither in puri-

ty nor ability—acting under the usual responsibility in a case of extreme delicacy—in a country too, emphatically of laws,—where guilt must be proved by legal evidence, and which in this instance particularly, seems to have been very severely scrutinized, and most scrupulously admitted.

Of the many falsehoods in which Mr. Pattison has indulged, none, perhaps, have been more fully detected than those now to be exposed. It is within the recollection of hundreds, that he constantly represented the tribunal that entertained the present case, as clerical in its nature, and entirely informal in its proceedings. Being regulated by no legal or established maxims, its decisions, he has studiously endeavoured to show, are not at all to be respected, and with equal confidence averring, that in Scotland, the same facility exists in the dissolution as the contraction of marriage. Let us now see what are the facts as stated in a late work, of the highest authority, in the history which is given of this Court, and of the policy regarding divorces.

"When the judicial power which came to be vested in the Roman Catholic clergy was, in common with the other privileges which they held under authority of the Pope, abolished at the time of the Reformation, there would have been either a general failure of justice, or an assumption of jurisdiction by some other tribunal, in those causes and matters of which the bishops and their officials had gradually acquired an exclusive cognizance, if an immediate provision had not been made for the dispatch of such cases. This was accordingly done in Scotland under royal authority; first, by the new nomination of Commissaries, one for each diocese; and again, soon after, by the establishment of a Commissary (or Consistorial) Court at Edinburgh, consisting of four judges, with more ample powers, which were defined by subsequent instructions or ordinances, and ratified by various acts of the legislature. To this court in particular was committed, in 1666, the power of deciding in all suits for declaring nullity of marriage, and in all actions of divorcement, to the exclusion not only of other civil courts in the first instance, but also of the inferior or provincial

commissaries by whom that jurisdiction had been possessed during the papal government. And further, by their original constitution, in 1563, the commissaries of Edinburgh were authorized to review the sentences of all other commissaries within Scotland. These powers they have possessed ever since. Again, when the right, or practice rather, of taking appeals to the Bishop of Rome was prohibited at the Reformation, all parties engaged in such appeals were, by act of parliament, in 1560, authorised to sue or defend the same before the Court of Session, or other temporal judges of the realm: and by a later statute, in the reign of James VI. (1609. chap. 6.) it was provided that the Court of Session should have power to judge of all decrees and sentences of the Commissaries of Edinburgh, 'alleged to have been wrongously pronounced by them;' and his majesty grants them a supreme commission for this purpose, authorizing them to advocate causes to themselves, (assume jurisdiction,) from any of the Commissaries, on lawful complaint made to them, but not otherwise. On this footing the jurisdiction still continues."

" *Divorce is not a favourite of the Scotch policy;* nor is the English altogether abhorrent from it. It is no doctrine of the Scotch code that marriage is a temporary compact, or that it depends for its duration in any respect on the contractors; that it is a yoke which can be taken off at the pleasure of either party, or of both. That code acknowledges to the fullest extent the peculiar nature of this sacred and primæval engagement;

'Sole property
In Paradise, of all things common else;'

it recognizes the union as irrevocable, as a contract between the two spouses for life, constituting between them a relation absolute and exclusive. But the most important obligations and conditions of the conjugal state may be infringed by one of the parties; and the law, considering human infirmity, as well as the danger of contamination, has, in certain grievous cases of this description, interfered of its own authority, not indeed by at once annulling the marriage,

but by allowing the other party, if innocent and desirous of using the privilege, to sue for an entire separation from the offender, and a dissolution of the state by which they were connected. Such is the Scotch law."*

In opposition to a decision in every respect so authoritative, it is replied, and on this much reliance is placed in his defence, that Mr. Pattison was not a party in the suit of Dr. Ure against his wife, and therefore was precluded from the introduction of evidence, which, had it been received, could not have failed to have secured his acquittal.†

Technically considered, Mr. Pattison was no party in the case. But he stood precisely on the same footing, as the paramour in all prosecutions of this nature, and to resort to such a subterfuge, shews how penurious are the materials of his vindication, and the desperate character of his cause. To commit the crime of which he is accused, requires two individuals, and the conviction of one concerned in the act, is equally a condemnation of both.

No one denies that Mrs. Ure was regularly *a party in court*, on trial for a criminal intercourse with Mr. Pattison, and can it be suspected, that she could be indifferent to so serious a proceeding? Lost to every sense of shame, the ordinary motives of interest and policy must have conspired to induce her to resist a conviction, and the consequent decree of separation, by which she was to be deprived of her share of the worldly goods, and endowments, of her husband.

We look in vain for proof of collusion between the hus-

* Review of Ferguson, on the Consistorial Court of Scotland, p. 282, and p. 271. London Quarterly Review, No. XLIX.

† There is here an inconsistency which cannot escape notice. The decision of the Scotch court, it is said, has no validity against him, since it was made on an ex parte statement. But in nearly the same breath, it is declared that the opinion of the Baltimore gentlemen, who "looked over my papers," is conclusive of my innocence.‡

‡ Vide Mr. Pattison's pamphlet, p. 38.

band and wife, and none indeed, on the trial was insinuated. Why then was not Mrs. Ure supplied by Mr. Pattison, and particularly, since, as it appears, she lived from the time the divorce was instituted, under his protection and entire control, with all his weighty documents and cogent reasoning, which it is alleged must inevitably have produced an opposite result, or in other words, a triumphant assertion of his innocence? Confessedly they were alike implicated in the matter, and the fate of the one was decisive of that of the other. But, this course being objectionable, on any account, why not sue Dr. Ure for defamation, an action readily to be sustained, and in which, the case would have been reviewed by another court, and all the facts fairly brought forward and discussed? Conscious of innocence, and willing to bring the matter to a legal investigation, by which only, he could be honourably acquitted, we might suppose, he would at once have commenced a prosecution against those by whom the charges have been so unreservedly repeated in this country, and more especially, as he has been challenged by a public advertisement in the papers to do so? But instead of adopting this decisive measure, he recurs to the loose statements of his friends, and seems content to seek refuge exclusively, in compurgatory expedients.

We would further ask the reason of his withholding the testimony, which so entirely exculpates him? To this call, so generally made, he answers, that from the "*peculiar character* of my documents,"* they cannot be published. But did this *peculiar* character prevent his printing them in Scotland, disseminating the pamphlet till suppressed by order of Court, and even reading it to his class? thus confessing what is too obscene for the public, is quite fit to be addressed to an assemblage of youth, whose morals were committed to his care!

The true reason for hitherto withholding the publication in this country, I am now to assign. The pamphlet containing his defence is made up principally of allegations that were

* Vide Mr. Pattison's pamphlet

preferred against Mrs. Ure and himself, with a commentary on the evidence, forming a laboured answer to the prosecution, so that had it come out, we should have been possessed of so much of the facts of the case, as to allow of a just decision, which of all things, he most fearfully deprecated and avoided.

An opinion however may be formed of this notable production from the following incident. As soon as a knowledge of the publication of it came to the municipal court of Glasgow, an *Interdict*, to use the Scotch term, a legal process, analogous to an injunction from a court of Chancery, is issued, forbidding the sale of it, on the ground of its containing a tissue of falsehoods, and *particularly* on account of the letter purporting to be from Dr. Ure to his wife.*

That this pamphlet was suppressed by a legal decree, is not denied. When asked at an interview with Dr. Physick, Dr. Dewees, and myself, for copies of it, he tells us that through the influence of Dr. Ure and his friends, the work had been seized by an order of court. This is fully confirmed in the letter from his friend Mr. Walker, who says: "Being prevented by some LEGAL RESTRAINT on the part of his adversaries from publishing it, I attended and heard it read, *as far as was permitted.*"†

The effect indeed, of this event, was most fatal. Even his best friends abandon him,—recall the testimonials they had previously granted, and with the denunciations of an incensed community, he precipitately retreats from Glasgow.

To the gentlemen of Baltimore, who rather incautiously,

* I assert this on the authority of a Scotch gentleman, who communicated it to General Cadwalader and myself. The fact however is now so generally known as not to be questioned.

† This alludes to an interruption which he experienced from the audience. It has been stated here by several gentlemen, and by one particularly, who on the occasion, was seated only a few feet from Mr. Pattison, that after a short time a scene of great confusion took place, which ended in the dispersal of the company, before one third of the defence was read.

on a statement entirely EX PARTE, vindicated, by a certificate, the innocence of Mr. Pattison, I now address myself, and call on them by all those high obligations, of which I will not permit myself to doubt they entertain a proper sense, to review the case—to mark the perfidy practised on them in the suppression of every tittle of criminatory evidence, and to counteract, by some efficient measure, the great and flagrant injustice which has been done, by the weight of their authority.

Circumstanced as I am, it may be conceived, how painfully I must have engaged in a controversy of this nature, so inconsistent with my principles, and the tenor of my conduct. The views of Mr. Pattison have already, in part, been attained by it. He has made himself known—an aim from which he never for a moment deviated,—though I am persuaded he will, henceforward, have to boast only of an infamous notoriety.

That I have not been actuated by any vindictive motives, in this case, my heart assures me. The controversy was of his own seeking, and most reluctantly did I approach this huge mass of moral putrefaction—being fully aware, that it was not to be stirred without contamination. Could I have discerned, even with the strong provocations I had received, a spirit of contrition, or of ordinary decency and moderation, in the habits and deportment of that individual, I think I should have remained silent. But in place of this, finding that his insolence increased in proportion to my forbearance, and that an immunity from punishment seemed to promise only a repetition of crime, I felt it incumbent on me to act as I have done.

Every system of ethics, as well as our own religion, imposes the duty alike of protecting virtue and repressing vice. An example, such as that of Mr. Pattison, is most pernicious in all its bearings. Exiled, according to the best testimony, by the frowns of the offended community in which he lived, is it fit that he should be here cordially received—polluting by his presence the purest society, and permitted

in full confidence, to practise among us a profession, which, of all others, exacts the greatest delicacy of feeling, and the highest sense of honour? These things are surely wrong, and cannot be endured.

To the American public, whose judgment is as correct, when duly enlightened, as its sentence is heavily penal, the whole matter is now laid open—with a pledge on my part that the hateful subject, as regards myself, is for ever dismissed.

N. CHAPMAN.

Philadelphia, September 1, 1821.

The succeeding pages have been carefully examined and collated by me, with the Transcript of the Record, duly authenticated, with the seal of office, and signature of the clerk of the Consistorial Court at Edinburgh.

WILLIAM FRY,
Printer.

Philadelphia, Sept. 1, 1821.

THE WHOLE

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS.

Duly authenticated,

IN THE

CASE OF DIVORCE

OF

ANDREW URE, M. D. v. *CATHARINE URE,*

FOR ADULTERY WITH

GRANVILLE SHARPE PATTISON.

TRIED IN THE CONSISTORY COURT

AT

EDINBURGH,

On the 30th of January, 1819.

EXTRACT.

DECREET OF DIVORCE.

Doctor Andrew Ure against Catharine Monteath,

1819.

AT EDINBURGH, the fifth day of February, and twenty-sixth day of March, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen years, anent the action and cause for divorce raised, intended, and pursued before the Commissaries of Edinburgh, at the instance of Doctor Andrew Ure, physician in Glasgow, with concourse of Mr. Patrick Wishart, Writer to the Signet, Procurator Fiscal of Court, for his interest, against Catharine Monteath, daughter of the late Gavin Monteath, sometime merchant in Greenock, and afterwards in the West Indies, and wife of the said Doctor Andrew Ure. By virtue of the said Commissaries there libelled, summons raised thereanent which maketh mention, that whereupon the twenty-eighth day of December, eighteen hundred seven, the private pursuer was regularly married at Woodfoot, parish of Houston, by the Reverend John Monteath, Minister of Houston, to Catharine Monteath, daughter of the late Gavin Monteath, sometime merchant in Greenock, and afterwards in the West Indies; and in consequence of their marriage they cohabited together as husband and wife, and acknowledged each other as such, and were holden and reputed married persons by all their friends, neighbours and acquaintances, and although by the laws of God, as well as by the mutual vows and faith, plighted to each other upon their entering into the aforesaid marriage, the pursuer, and the said Catharine Mon-

teath, were reciprocally bound to a strict adherence to each other, and to that constancy and chastity which ought to be inseparable from the married state,—yet true it was, and of verity, that the said Catharine Monteath, casting off the fear of God, and disregarding her matrimonial vows and engagements, whereby she stood bound and obliged to preserve the marriage bed, had, during the latter part of the year eighteen hundred and seventeen, and since the month of January last, eighteen hundred and eighteen, given herself up at many different times and places to adulterous practices, fellowship, and correspondence, with lewd and wicked men, one or more known not to be the pursuer, and to the having carnal adulterous intercourse, and dealing with the said lewd and wicked men, one or more of them, in several different houses and places in the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, and at Fairlie, near Largs and Falkirk, and suburbs of these different places, and in other places yet to the private pursuer unknown. And more particularly, the said Catharine Monteath, after living happily as the wife of the pursuer, after their marriage did form, during the years eighteen hundred and seventeen, and eighteen hundred and eighteen, a most unlawful and unvirtuous intimacy and connexion with a man or men, known not to be the private pursuer, and whom he expected to be able to condescend upon in the course of the proceedure or action to follow hereon, in consequence whereof, she became pregnant, and after confessing her guilt, and stating that the child was in consequence of an adulterous intercourse, she was dismissed from the society of the pursuer and family, and had since been secretly supported and maintained under false names and in obscure lodgings, in an adulterous manner at Falkirk and Edinburgh by said man or men not the pursuer, or others by his or their direction and authority, at his or their expense, since the beginning of August last, when she was so dismissed; at least during the year eighteen hundred and fourteen, and particularly in the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, and the month of November, eighteen

hundred and eighteen, the said Catharine Monteath had carnal and adulterous intercourse and connexion with a man or men known not to be the pursuer, and had been living under his or their protection, and at his or their expense, since August last, at the places foresaid, and which she had acknowledged in different ways and upon sundry occasions. From all which it was evident, that the said Catharine Monteath had been guilty of the crime of adultery, and therefore concluding that the said Dr. Andrew Ure, pursuer, ought, and should to have the said Commissaries, their sentence and decree, finding and decerning, that the said Catharine Monteath had been guilty of adultery, and divorcing and separating her from the pursuer, his society, fellowship and company, and finding, declaring and decerning, the said Catharine Monteath to have forfeited all the rights and privileges of a lawful wife, and finding, declaring and decerning, that the said pursuer is entitled to marry any free woman, as if he had never been married to her, or as if she the defender was naturally dead. Herefore, &c. and anent the charge and citation lawfully given to the said Catharine Monteath, defender, by John Ferrier, Macer of Court, who, upon the second day of December, one thousand eight hundred and eighteen years, by virtue of the foresaid libelled summons passed, and in his majesty's name and authority lawfully summoned, warned and charged, the said Catharine Monteath, defender, to have compeared before the said Commissaries at Edinburgh, upon the eighteenth and twenty-fifth days of December, then current for first and second diets, in the hour of cause to have answered at the instance of the said pursuer, Dr. Andrew Ure, in the matter libelled, and the said Macer made certification as effered. *This he did, by delivering to the said Catharine Monteath, defender, personally apprehended a full double of the said summons, to the will with a citation thereto subjoined to the effect foresaid, which citation was subscribed by the said Macer, and did bear the date of his execution, date of said summons, with the names and designations of the witnesses present at the premises.* As the said libelled sum-

mons, dated the second day of December, one thousand eight hundred and eighteen years, and execution thereof, of the date foresaid in themselves more fully bear, which action being called in presence of the said Commissaries, the said Dr. Andrew Ure, pursuer, compeared, by Richard Prentice, Solicitor at Law in Edinburgh, his procurator, who for him produced the foresaid libelled summons, and execution thereof, and the said Catharine Monteath failing to appear, but afterwards appearing, as after mentioned. The before written libelled summons, execution thereof, condescendence for the pursuer, pursuer's oath of calumny, minute for him, writings produced, oaths and depositions of the witnesses, petitions for the defender, answers for the pursuer, surgeon's certificate, and affidavit of the defender after engrossed, and whole process having been at length heard, read, seen and considered, by the said Commissaries, and they being therewith and with the hail steps of proceedure had in the cause, well and ripely advised, *they, by their decreet found, and hereby find, facts, circumstances, and qualifications, proved relevant to infer the defender's guilt of adultery with Granville Sharpe Pattison, mentioned in the proof found, and hereby find, the said Catharine Monteath, defender, guilty of adultery with the said Granville Sharpe Pattison;* accordingly, therefore, divorced and separated, and hereby divorce and separate, the said Catharine Monteath, defender, from the said Doctor Andrew Ure, pursuer, his society, fellowship, and company, found and declared, and hereby find and declare the said Catharine Monteath, to have forfeited all the rights and privileges of a lawful wife, found and declared, and hereby find and declare, that the said Doctor Andrew Ure, pursuer, is entitled to marry any free woman as if he had never been married to the said Catharine Monteath, defender, or as if she was naturally dead, and decerned and hereby decern. Because at first calling of the said action, which was in presence of the said Commissaries, upon the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen years, the said Doctor Andrew Ure, compearing as aforesaid, by the said Richard Prentice, his procurator, who

for him, produced the foresaid libelled summons and execution, thereof, and the said Catharine Monteath, defender, though oft times called, failing to appear, the Commissaries made avizandum, and having considered the libel and execution, they, by their Interlocutor, dated the eighth day of January, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, before further proceedure, appointed the pursuer to lodge a special condescendence, and therein to state the name of the person with whom it was alleged the defender had been guilty of adultery, in terms of the regulations of Court, as the said Interlocutor reported in Court on the date thereof bears, and at a calling of the cause, the same day, the said Richard Prentice gave in the following condescendence for the pursuer, bearing: That since this action was raised and called in Court, the pursuer had been confirmed in his suspicions as to the person guilty with his wife, and now knew and verily believed, the adulterer to be Granville Sharpe Pattison, Surgeon in Glasgow. The pursuer also, in addition to the very special statement in his libel, now farther condescended, and said, that his wife, the defender, had adulterous intercourse and connexion with the said Granville Sharpe Pattison, or other man or men, known not to be the pursuer, in the pursuer's house at Glasgow, and other places there, during the months of January, February, March and April, eighteen hundred and eighteen—at the pursuer's sea bathing quarters at Fairlie, near Largs, in June or July same year—at Falkirk, in the house of William Mitchell, weaver, there during the months of August, September, and October, same year, and during the period thereafter, and until the raising of the present divorce, in the house of ———— Douglas, tailor, in Carnegia Street, Edinburgh, and other places there.

Of these facts, and of all others, tending to support the same and guilt of the defender, and the regular marriage of the parties, the pursuer craved a proof, in respect whereof, and as the said condescendence, signed by the said Richard Prentice bears, to which the following list of witnesses were subjoined. List of Witnesses' names: Jean Lindsay,

wife of ——— Dykes, blockcutter, Bonhill, near Dumbarton: Agnes or Nanny Sydeserf, residing in Glasgow; Mrs. ——— Park, keeper of lodgings there; James Monteath, writer there; George Monteath, surgeon there; Mary M'Donald, residing there; Catharine ——, late servant of the pursuer, now residing at Anderston, near Glasgow; Agnes Blair, wife of William Mitchell, weaver, in Falkirk; Ann Simpson, residing in Falkirk, servant, or lately servant of the said William Mitchell; Christian Sterling, wife of James Baird, residing in Falkirk; ——— Douglas, tailor, Carnegia Street, Edinburgh; ——— ———, wife of the said ——— Douglas; ——— ———, servant, or inmate of the said ——— Douglas; ——— ———, keeper of lodgings, Arthur Street, Edinburgh; ——— ———, servant, or lately servant in said lodgings; James Gemmell, writer in Edinburgh; Dr. John Thatcher, there; James Burn, writer to the signet, Edinburgh; Andrew Burn, Windmill Street, there; Miss Margaret Pattison, daughter of the late John Pattison, cotton spinner, Glasgow; with which the said Commissaries made avizandum, and having considered the condescendence for the pursuer, they, by their Interlocutor, dated the said eighth day of January, appointed the pursuer to appear in Court and depone *de calumnia*, as the said Interlocutor bears. Accordingly compeared the pursuer, Doctor Andrew Ure, who being solemnly sworn, kneeling with his right hand on the holy E angel and examined *de calumnia*, depones, that he has just cause to insist on the present action of divorce against the defender, Catharine Monteath, his wife, because he believes she has been guilty of Adultery, and that the facts stated in his libel and condescendence, which have been read over to him are true,—*depones, that there has been no concert or collusion between him and the said defender in raising this action in order to obtain a divorce against her; nor does he know, believe, or suspect, that there has been any concert or agreement between any other person on his behalf and the said defender, or any other person, on her behalf, with a view, or for the purpose of obtaining such divorce, al*

which, is truth, as the deponent shall answer to GOD,—as the said oath of calumny, dated said eighth day of January, signed by the pursuer, and by one of the said Commissaries bears—with which the Commissaries made avizandum, and having considered the pursuer's oath of calumny, and resumed consideration of the libel and condescendence, they, by their Interlocutor, dated the 15th day of the said month of January, allowed the pursuer a proof thereof, and granted diligence, the proof to be led and concluded within two months from that date, as the said Interlocutor reported in Court, on the date thereof bears. On the nineteenth day of the said month of January, the said Richard Prentice gave in the following minute for the pursuer, bearing.

Prentice, for the pursuer, stated, that since lodging the condescendence, he had received from the pursuer, copy of a letter written by the defender, from Falkirk, upon the fourteenth of August, eighteen hundred and eighteen, to the adulterer, then at Paris, a copy of which the pursuer had received in the following manner.

After the defender had left the pursuer's house, she went to Falkirk, and being in an unhappy state, she made a full declaration of her guilt by said letter, to the adulterer, and calling on him to support her, and she sent the pursuer a copy of said letter, being that now produced, which it would be proved, was of the defender's hand-writing, as the said minute signed by the said Richard Prentice bears.

Follows the copy of the letter referred to in said minute.

Falkirk, 14th August, 1818. With a mind overwhelmed with grief, and a breaking heart, I again sit down to address you. It is to me a task of the most painful kind, but my forlorn and destitute situation, calls loudly for you to come and give me relief. *Oh! Granville, will nothing awaken your feelings or compassion towards me. Must I die here in misery and want, without one consoling word from you, the author of all my misfortunes. These dreadful misfortunes, I say, have been the cause of much sorrow to me; yes, it has separated me from one of the best and most indulgent husbands, and from my dear, dear children.* What

do you think my sufferings must have been upon such an awful occasion? Oh God! when I yet recall that sad, sad scene, to memory, my heart fainteth within me. Great is my distress indeed, and not one friend to heave a sigh for me. My health is fast declining. It is almost impossible I can long survive in this state. Though sinful I know is the thought, but often, when I am laid upon my bed at night, I wish I may not see the light of another morning. Would to God, I were prepared for such an important change. It would be relieving a poor sufferer from many cares and sorrows, that she is at present ill able to bear. I am living here in obscure lodgings, and in perfect retirement, hiding myself from my friends—concealing the situation I am in. *I have no claim upon my husband—that is now over, and what am I to do?* Am I to be allowed to starve here to death, and not a creature to look to me? And allow me to ask you, what is to become of the innocent offspring that may be looked for in a short time? *I am now five months and a half gone with child to you.*—I therefore request, that you will instantly write to me, and say what provision you are to make for the child and me. By return of post I will expect to hear from you. I must have relief in some way or other, and if you neglect this, I will instantly write to your sister, and lay the whole before her, and at the same time inform her, of your sending to me *a writer to the signet while I was at Fairlie. This I thought a very cruel thing. I did not suppose you could have been capable of it. How do you think I could feel upon seeing such a person? I think you might have had more delicacy in giving up my name to such a fellow.* He is truly a writer. I wrote him three letters without receiving any satisfaction. The third I sent by a confidential friend, without giving up your name, nor have I yet done so. My situation is by no means an ordinary one. Your agent said, he had never seen a person that interested him more than I did, and that surely, when you saw me, you would feel very different. You need not suppose you can escape from this; your frequent visits were taken notice of by the servants at my house. The child

you must take, *as you well know that you are the undoubted father of it.* I think it would be very proper for you to come home soon, and make such arrangements as will be found necessary for me. You have brought me into this awful state, and it is to you alone, that I can look to for support, and to relieve me as far as you can in a time of such distress. You may write to me with perfect safety here. I am an entire stranger, not a soul knows me, and not a friend near me. I take the name of Mrs. Campbell: address to me by that name, at William Mitchell's, Vicar Lane, Falkirk.

N. B. I will wait with patience for a fortnight, in that time a letter can arrive. I therefore again entreat you, to write me, and relieve the mind of her who is the most wretched of all human beings.

And the said Richard Prentice having procured the said Commissaries their precept and diligence for summoning witnesses, for proving the pursuer's libel and condescendence, caused, summon and did lead and adduce, several witnesses, who being received, solemnly sworn, and examined, as after mentioned, did severally depone as follows, viz.

Agnes Sydeserf, servant to the pursuer, aged forty-three years, and not married, who being solemnly sworn, kneeling with the right hand on the Holy Evangel, and purged of malice, partial counsel, and good deed and reward, and interrogated, depones:

That the deponent was servant in the family of Dr. and Mrs. Ure, the parties in this cause, at their house in the city of Glasgow, from Martinmas eighteen hundred and seventeen, to the term of Whitsunday last,—depones, that Dr. and Mrs. Ure were known to be married persons, and lived together as husband and wife, and had three children then alive in family with them, and acknowledged as their lawful offspring. Depones,—that during her service aforesaid, Mr. Granville Sharpe Pattison, Surgeon in Glasgow, *often visited in Dr. Ure's house.* Depones,—that from the commencement of his course, which was about Martinmas eighteen hundred and seventeen, as she thinks, Dr. Ure lec-

tured as professor of the Glasgow or Andersonian Institution, from three to four in the afternoon, and from seven to eight in the evening, upon all the lawful days in the week, except Saturday, between eight and nine in the evening. Upon Monday, Wednesday and Friday, weekly, and upon the Saturdays, to a mechanical class between eight and ten in the evening. Depones,—that the lectures were at the Doctor's own house till about the first of January, and were afterwards delivered at the hall of the Institution, which may be distant a gun shot from the Doctor's house, till the course closed at the Sacrament time in April following, except the lectures which were given between eight and nine in the evening, as aforesaid, which continued to be given at his own house, from the beginning to the end of the course.

Interrogated,—whether there was any circumstance which led her to suspect improper intimacy between Mrs. Ure and Mr. Pattison during her service? Depones and answers, his visits were frequent, and Mrs. Ure shewed pleasure in seeing him, and in speaking of him; but I paid no particular attention, till my fellow-servant Jean Lindsay, told me one day, after the new year, as I think, that she had happened to go into the dining room where Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure were alone together, to get something that was wanted from a press in that room, and had found *Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure standing close together in a way that made her suspect something wrong between them.* Depones and adds, Jean Lindsay and I were in the kitchen together, when Jean went into the dining room: on that occasion the bell had not rung, and she went off herself into the room for what was wanted. Interrogated,—was Dr. Ure in the house? Depones and answers, "no sir, he was out. I think it was in the forenoon, and not at lecture time, but the Doctor was out." Interrogated. Did Mr. Pattison upon that occasion call for Dr. or Mrs. Ure? Depones and answers, I do not recollect, nor do I recollect, whether I, or my fellow-servant, answered when he called. Interrogated,—what she observed in particular between Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure after this occasion? Depones and answers, Mrs. Ure often shewed Mr.

Pattison out herself when he called at the house, and took the candle for that purpose herself in the evenings, without calling me or my fellow-servant. About a fortnight before Dr. Ure's lecture closed, the Doctor went several times to Greenock, and as I understood, to collect preparations for lectures. At one of these times, when he was at Greenock, and as I think on the Friday before the Sabbath of the preparation sermon, which is delivered a week before the Sacrament, I happened to be out in the forenoon. When I came back, I rang the house bell—Mrs. Ure herself opened the door to me—*she looked flurried, and not as usual*—she said hastily to me, I have been looking long for the keys for Dr. Pattison, and have not got them. Depones and adds, Mrs. Ure immediately turned away her face from me, and left me. I then thought she was angry with me: she went into the dining room immediately, and did not ask or receive from me, the answer to several messages with which she had sent me out. I went into the kitchen, and my fellow-servant was not there—she was out with the children. I did not go into the dining room, or see Mr. Pattison or hear him speaking to Mrs. Ure. If he was not there, there was no other person in the house but myself, and I did not let him out, or see him go out. Not long after Mrs. Ure let me in, perhaps about twenty minutes, she looked into the kitchen and said to me, I have got the keys and am going over to the Institution with them, and I heard her go out. A good while afterwards, not so long as an hour, perhaps more than twenty minutes, Mrs. Ure came back again to the house, and said the keys did not fit, and desired me to take over to the Institution some other inner keys of locked up places there, which she gave me, and if Mr. Pattison was not at the Institution, to look for him at the paint shop adjoining, or wait for him at the Institution. I went accordingly, and could not find Dr. Pattison, nor did he ever appear to me there. Interrogated. Depones and answers, my fellow-servant was not come back with the children, when I was sent out with the keys to the Institution, nor was she come back when I returned from the Institution. I saw nobody in the house

when I came back from the Institution but my mistress. She told me there were some things of Dr. Pattison's locked up in the Institution, which he wanted. We knew that *Dr. Pattison had a key of his own to the outer door of the Institution*, as one of the *surgeons who attended there*. Interrogated,—if she rang more than once, when she came back with the answers to the messages, as aforesaid, before she got in. Depones and answers, I think I did. I waited for some time before my mistress let me in. Interrogated. Is there a book room in Dr. Ure's house, which is separated from the kitchen by a thin partition of wood? Depones and answers, "yes, a very thin partition, through which we could hear quite well what was said in the book room. Interrogated. Does she remember Mrs. Ure and Mr. Pattison being alone together upon any occasion in that book room, and did she then observe any thing suspicious or particular? Depones and answers. On the Friday night before the Sacrament, as I think, Dr. Ure was again at Greenock—A Mrs. Cameron drunk tea that evening with my mistress. About eight o'clock that evening, when Mrs. Cameron was with my mistress, in the dining room, Dr. Pattison called. When he was pretty far in the lobby, I told him that Mrs. Cameron was with my mistress. It was I that let him in—he went into the dining room.—I saw my mistress come out of the dining room soon afterwards with Dr. Pattison, and go with him into the book room,—she had a candle in her hand: she and Mr. Pattison remained together some time in the book room. I listened and could not hear them speaking in the book room. Interrogated. Did you hear any thing at all in the book room while they were there? Depones and answers, I listened first in the lobby a little, and heard nothing—then I checked myself, and went into the kitchen. When I checked myself, I heard something stirring, which rather seemed to be in the lobby up stairs. I did not like to be observed, in case my mistress should come out again." Interrogated. How long did she and Mr. Pattison then remain together alone in the book room? Depones and answers, I cannot say how long it was—aye, ten

minutes? Depones and answers, I understood that Mr. Pattison was to set out next day for Paris and that he did so. Interrogated—whether she has observed Mr. Pattison call twice in one day at Dr. Ure's house, and any thing particular upon that occasion? Depones and answers, I remember on the Wednesday of the week after the preparation Sabbath, Dr. Ure lectured from eight to ten at his mechanical class that night—this was the day before the fast. The lecture was an extra lecture. *Dr. and Mrs. Ure were engaged that night to tea and supper at the house of a friend of Mr. Pattison in York Street.* I forget the name of the family. There was to be a party there, *upon account of Dr. Pattison's going away to Paris*,—it was a very rough day. *Mrs. Ure was to go with Dr. Pattison in a carriage called a noddy.* The party broke up owing to excuses on account of the weather, and Dr. Pattison came to our house and drank tea to Dr. and Mrs. Ure. He went away after tea, but came back after eight o'clock, *when Dr. Ure was gone to lecture, and Mrs. Ure was alone in the dining room.* I let him in, he said he had left his handkerchief—he went himself, and lifted it up from below the lobby table, as if he knew where he had left it. He then went into the dining room to Mrs. Ure—he staid with her there *about half an hour or more:* when he came out, Mrs. Ure, herself, came out with him, and showed him down stairs with a candle herself. Mrs. Ure after she came back, said to me as making a joke of it, that Dr Pattison was gone to supper at York Street, and that he was very angry about the excuse which had not been sent to him or his sister, and was sent to Mrs. Ure after she had been dressed, and too late, that is to say, he was angry because his friends at York Street had *prevented Dr. and Mrs. Ure from going there* by the excuse." Interrogated. If she remembers any other occasion when Mr. Pattison called a second time in one day as for his handkerchief, and what then happened. Depones and answers, about the same time Dr. Pattison called for Mrs. Ure one night, and was with her in the dining room. After he went away, his handkerchief was found in the lobby and given to Mrs. Ure.

He called next forenoon for it, and went in to Mrs. Ure, who was in the dining room, to get it. Interrogated. Depones and answers, I think she was then alone with him in the dining room, but am not certain. Interrogated, if there was a bed closet with a bed in it, which entered from the dining room, and of which the deponent had the charge, and if she observed any thing particular in the appearance of the bed after Dr. Pattison had been with her mistress in the dining room? Depones and answers, I will not take it upon me to say so upon oath; that bed was often disordered, and the children often played upon it—once in particular, I had dressed it up as some visitors were expected—I found it disordered, but I am not certain at this distance of time, that Dr. Pattison had been alone with my mistress before I made this observation. Interrogated. Depones—that Dr. Pattison got the keys of the Institution and brought them back to Dr. Ure's house on the forenoon of the day aforesaid, but the deponent cannot remember who gave them to him, or how he then got them. Causa scientia patet, all which, is truth, as she shall answer to God. Depones—she cannot write.

Farther interrogated. Depones—that Mrs. Ure herself showed Mr. Pattison out, and down stairs that night he was with her in the book room, as aforesaid, and this also is truth, as she shall answer to God.

Jean Lindsay, wife of James Dykes, blockcutter at Bonhill, near Dumbarton, aged twenty-three years, who being solemnly sworn, kneeling and purged &c. ut supra, and examined, depones, that the deponent was servant to Dr. and Mrs. Ure, for twelve months preceding Whitsunday last, and during the last six months of her service, took care of their children. Interrogated. Did you during the last half year of your service, at any time, observe any improper or suspicious behaviour between Dr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure? Depones and answers, one day in winter, I cannot say exactly in what time of the season, I came in with the youngest child from a walk, and went for a spoon to the dining room to give the youngest child her lunch. As I opened the door, I observed *Dr. Pattison and my mistress standing face to*

face, and close together, at the brace piece, one of his arms was about her. When I opened the door, his arm fell down from her shoulder, her face dyed up red—she was in confusion, and stooped, as if to lift (some) something. I took the spoon and went away, as fast as I could.

Interrogated. Were they alone together, in the dining room? Depones and answers,—they were. Interrogated. Depones and answers, I mentioned this circumstance afterwards to my fellow Agnes Sydeserf. Interrogated, if she ever at any other time, observed any suspicious or improper behaviour between Mrs. Ure and Mr. Pattison? Depones and answers,—I never afterwards went into the room when they were together, unless when I was called by the bell to take away the children, or for some other purpose. Farther interrogated. Depones and answers,—one day when I was out with the little child, I learnt upon my return, that my mistress had been searching for the keys of the Institution to Dr. Pattison, and had been out with him, at the Institution. In the afternoon, as I suppose, of that day, Dr. Pattison rung at the door, which I answered. He gave me the keys of the Institution, and went away. My mistress, when I laid them into the sideboard drawer of the dining room, where they commonly lay, said to me, is that Dr. Pattison? I answered it was. She sent me to call him back to speak to her; I did so—he came back and went with my mistress into the dining room where she was alone. Interrogated. Depones and answers, this was in the after part of the day,—I cannot remember whether it was before or after dinner,—the candles were not lighted. Interrogated. Depones and answers, I cannot say how long he remained with my mistress on this occasion, perhaps a quarter of an hour,—I cannot recollect whether she showed him out herself, or one of us, the servants. Interrogated. If Mr. Pattison sometimes called on Mrs. Ure oftener than once in one day? Depones and answers, from what I heard, and what I saw together, I understood *that he sometimes called for her twice or thrice in one day, and twice the apology was, that he had left his handkerchief.* On one of these occasions, I opened the door

to him myself, and told him his handkerchief had been given to my mistress. He then went into the dining room to my mistress to get it. Interrogated. Depones and answers, to the best of my knowledge she was then alone. Interrogated. Depones and answers, *Dr. Pattison's calls for Mrs. Ure were frequent, and very often made at the hours when Dr. Ure was lecturing at the Institution, and were also made on the days when he was absent at Greenock.* Interrogated. Depones, upon coming down stairs from the children one night, my fellow servant Agnes Sydeserf told me Dr. Pattison and my mistress had been alone together in the book room, she Agnes Sydeserf said, she had not heard them either speaking or moving in that room. Interrogated. Depones and answers, when Mr. Pattison and my mistress were alone together, it was generally in the dining room. Interrogated. Depones and answers, *there was a small bed room or closet with a bed in it off the dining room, and which entered from the dining room.* Interrogated. Depones and answers, Dr. Pattison left Glasgow to go to Paris in April last—he was at our house the night before—Dr. Ure was then at Greenock. Interrogated. If after Pattison went away on that or any other occasion, she has seen her mistress *confused and in tears?* Depones and answers, I have seen *her confused and in tears after he had left her*, but I cannot say for what cause, or that it was because he had left her. Interrogated. Depones and answers, Dr. and Mrs. Ure lived as husband and wife, and were held to be married persons, and their children to be lawful children. Causa scientia patet,—all which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

Mrs. Mary Park, wife of Robert Park, deceased, lodging keeper, in Glasgow, aged forty, and upwards, who being solemnly sworn, kneeling, &c. purged, &c. ut supra—and interrogated. Depones and answers,—I have known long the parties and their families. My husband and I were neighbours of Mrs. Ure's family before her marriage, and I have continued to be intimate with them since they were married. Interrogated. Depones and answers,—I received a letter from the defender by post in October last, which I now produce.

I am certain that letter is of Mrs. Ure's hand writing, with which I am perfectly familiar. The letter produced by the deponent, being subscribed by the deponent, and judge examinator, as relative hereto; and the other letter produced in process with a minute of this date, being exhibited to the deponent, and she having examined it, and being interrogated, depones and answers, "Oh yes, that also is her hand writing, the ink only is fainter in the one than in the other of these letters," and this letter likewise being subscribed by the deponent and judge examinator as relative hereto. Interrogated, if the deponent saw the defender Mrs. Ure in Edinburgh, after she received the letter which the deponent has produced? Depones and answers, I saw her twice in Edinburgh, after receiving it, first on the fifth of November, and secondly, on the second of December last, at Edinburgh. Interrogated, if she *then confessed* to the deponent, that she had been *guilty of adultery with Granville Sharpe Pattison, surgeon in Glasgow*. Depones and answers, she was in great distress on account of her situation, and always acknowledged her guilt, but on the first occasion, she would by no means tell with whom she had been guilty. On the second occasion, she had been *newly delivered of her child;* I asked if he, *Granville Sharpe Pattison was the father of it? She answered me "yes." She was so much agitated and distressed, that I could not press her farther on the subject.* At her desire, I staid with her all night, and I did ask what was to be done with the child? She answered, that it was intended to be given out to nurse, but she did not know how to part with it. Interrogated. Depones and answers, Mrs. Ure latterly lived at Edinburgh, under the name of Mrs. Thompson. Interrogated. Depones and answers, she bore this name at Edinburgh when she was delivered—she had before lived at Falkirk, under the name of Mrs. Campbell. I think she left her husband's house at Glasgow in August or September before her delivery, and lived at Falkirk separated from him. Causa scientia patet, all which is truth as she shall answer to God.

James Gemmell, writer in Edinburgh, aged twenty-eight

years, and not married, who being solemnly sworn, kneeling and purged, &c. ut antea, and interrogated, in initialibus, by the judge examinator, whether he has had any employment or communication with either of the parties as a man of business, in relation to this cause? Depones and answers, I was acquainted with them, when they lived together as husband and wife. The pursuer Dr. Ure, came to me before instituting any action against his wife, the defender, and laid before me a declaration in writing, which Mrs. Ure had made and which was written with her own hand, as he said, although not otherwise addressed, except by the words *Oh! Granville*, with which an appeal in the body of that writing commences. I believe he intended to consult me as a man of business; but I told him, I was not an agent before the Commissary Court, and could not accept any employment there. He had two interviews with me upon this subject, at my house, upon the same day. In the first, he stated the case to me, not as his own, but as the case of a friend. In the second, he acknowledged the case to be his own, and said he was most anxious to ascertain what really was the truth, and was extremely agitated. He, therefore, requested me to see Mrs. Ure, his wife, and learn from her, if she would state to me how the fact really stood. He told me that she was in this city, and that Mrs. Park, the preceding witness, was with her, and would procure an interview for me. Interrogated. Did you go accordingly to Mrs. Ure's lodgings, and hold an interview with her, and report to her husband what passed at that interview? Depones and answers, "yes, I did." The judge examinator, makes avizandum with this examination, in initialibus, and in the mean time, allows the witness to withdraw, and appoints the examination to proceed no farther.

James Monteath, writer in Glasgow, aged twenty-eight years, and not married, who being solemnly sworn, kneeling &c. purged, &c. ut supra, and interrogated in initialibus, by the judge examinator, whether he had been in any way consulted by either of the parties relative to the cause? Depones and answers, I certainly was, being a second cousin of Mrs.

Ure's, and intimate with her for eighteen or twenty years, and with Dr. Ure and her, since their marriage. He did lay before me a state of the case in November last, and asked my opinion, whether he ought to institute legal proceedings, which I gave to him, and I also wrote twice or oftener to Mr. Gemmell, the preceding witness, upon the subject, and for information from Mr. Gemmell. The judge examinator, makes avizandum with the above deposition in initialibus.

Prentice for the pursuer, stated, that it was intended to examine Mr. Monteath in causa merely, for the purpose of identifying the two writings under the hand of Mrs. Ure, the defender, which had been produced in process, and of proving further by the testimony of Mr. Monteath, that these were of her writing. The judge examinator, in respect, that the writings in question are not to be regarded as documents, to which an agent falls to bear testimony, as executed or attested by him in his professional or official capacity, but as ordinary written evidence, produced by a party pursuer against a party defender, and which it is incumbent upon the pursuer to authenticate by the ordinary modes of probation, and subject to the common rules of law, declines to proceed further, at present, in the examination of Mr. Monteath, and makes avizandum, likewise with this minute. Edinburgh, twenty-second of January, eighteen hundred and nineteen.

The Commissaries having considered the depositions of James Gemmell, and James Monteath, in initialibus, find they are inadmissible witnesses for the pursuer in this action. Edinburgh, twenty-sixth day of January, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen.

Prentice for the pursuer stated, that since last diet of proof, the pursuer had discovered amongst some papers belonging to the defender in a trunk, in his house, a note holograph of the defender, and addressed to the sister of Granville Sharpe Pattison, inquiring Pattison's address at Paris, and with Miss Pattison's answer, containing the address, written in

pencil thereon, and he now produces the same, to be verified as the defender's hand writing.

Follows the letters. Edinburgh, October 23, 1818. You must let me know if my sister is at home or in Glasgow, for I must write to her to go to look after the children. My Dear Friend, I arrived here in safety upon Wednesday evening, and would have written to you yesterday, but my fatigue was so great that I was unable to do it. I came in a post chaise to the end of Prince's Street; I shifted my trunk into a coach which I got on the stand, paid the driver and returned him. This is all for safety. I then drove to number 8, Windmill Street, where Mr. B. was waiting for me, to accompany me to my lodgings, which he had procured in number 2, Arthur Street. The situation is a most desirable one, the house is perfectly new, and stands at the foot of Salsbury Craigs, and is in the midst of gardens. The view is almost as fine a one as you could wish for, and very well aired. I may think myself fortunate in having got such a place, for they are not to be had. Students coming to town, makes them very ill at present to get, to a person that is not to keep them for the winter. The landlady of this house is an unmarried woman, middle aged, who has been an upper servant in the best houses for sixteen years. Her furniture is all new, and very good, and she herself most obliging. She brings every thing to me in the neatest way; my breakfast is brought in upon a tray, with a damask cloth upon it, and every thing in the same way. You can have an idea from the houses she has lived in, how she will conduct herself. I have a parlour and a very good bed room. I am now become Mrs. Thompson, a lady from the country, in bad health, come to be near medical assistance. I trust every thing will be kept snug. She had some hesitation about the lying business. It was only this morning, that she made up her mind to let me remain till that time. Great caution is now required about my letters—she must see the Glasgow post mark, and that will never do. It will be best, perhaps, to address them to Mr. B.'s care, and he wil send them enclosed to me. He is most attentive, and says I must want

for nothing to make me comfortable. He has brought me a supply of books to amuse me, so the time will wear on. I think him a very gentlemanny lad—he seems to feel for me like a brother. It is now more than *ten long weeks since I left my beloved family. How many days and nights have I spent since that time of the most poignant sorrow—but through the strength of God, I trust, I may yet be invited to them. What would I give to see them: they are never from my mind, day nor night, and my dear boy to be ill, how unfortunate when I was from home.* I dare ask nothing, I tremble even to think, but I have been at a loss to know the cause of your silence. I trust, however, that it may not be bad health, that prevents you from writing. I also hope that I have done nothing that has given you offence, or I should never forgive myself. Since I came to town, I have heard the melancholy accounts of your worthy pastor's death, Dr. Balfour. I was told he was taken ill upon the street, and never reached his home till he died. I would fain hope that it may not be true: it has given me much concern. Would to God I was as well fitted for this important change. I think, if there ever was a saint upon earth, he was one, and his loss will be a most unspeakable one. He has left few to equal him. My lumber would arrive this morning. I did not write, for I was not able, having been in bed almost all the day before I left that vile house. You cannot imagine the insolence I received from these two wretches. I suppose, had I been confined in their house, I would have been ruined by them. They were both alike, the man and the woman. When I got a little bit of meat, they both instantly examined it, and would have taken as much of it as they thought decency would admit, and every thing in the same way. I would have known nothing at all of this, had it not been for the servant girl—she was the most faithful, fine girl, I have seen for a long time. She came flying to me with a little bit of beef she had bought, to me, and desired me to keep it by me, for they would have part of it, and the maule also every thing in that they could lay their hands upon. Was it any wonder, that I wished to be from among them. My heart was

like to break, to think of all the distress I was suffering, and these brutes destroying any thing they could lay their hands upon. The poor girl was in great distress at my going away —she cried for three days*
although I were her mother she could not
me I did not fail to remind her
will you my dear friend write me
you receive this, I would wish if possible to hear of my dear children once a week at least. I know not how I am to write to my husband. There is no servant in the house that I could send to the post-office. The woman has a sister who lives with her, but I should not like them to see my letters. I shall write no more till I hear from you. Be so kind as to let my friends know of me. God bless you, farewell. If it is thought safe to address my letters to the house, there is a woman of the same name upon this stair, and a great work has been about her letters. But address to Mrs. Thompson at Mr. James Browns Wright, 2, Arthur Street. This is the husband of the sister who lives in the house, will you address to me, but to Mr. B. in the blank cover, and he will forward it.

Ed. 19 Jan. 1819. Referred to in my deposition of this date (signed) Mary Park. Ja. Fergusson. Ed. 26 Jan. 1819. Referred to in my deposition of this date (signed) Geo. C. Monteath, Ja. Fergusson.

Dear Miss Pattison, I was very sorry to hear of your indisposition, I beg therefore to know how you feel yourself to day. The gentleman who wanted your brother's address wishes to know when you expect to hear from him, as he would wish a more direct one. I go out of town this afternoon, but will be home in a few days. Believe me yours ever truly, (signed) C. Ure. Wednesday morning.

Dear Mrs. U.—Granville's address is Avec Madame Arnhuter, No. 17 Rue d'Enfer, Fauxburgh St. Germans à Paris. In great haste, (Signed) M. P. Ed. 26 Jan. 1819. Referred to in my deposition of this date. (Signed) Geo. C. Monteath, Ja. Fergusson.

* Letter here torn.

Compeared, George C. Monteath, Surgeon in Glasgow, aged twenty nine years, not married, who being solemnly sworn kneeling, &c. purged, &c. ut supra, and interrogated, depones, that for at least fifteen years past, the deponent has been upon terms of intimacy with the defender, who is his second cousin, and being shewn the letter No. 7 of process produced by Mary Park, a preceding witness, and interrogated, depones and answers. "*I am quite certain that letter is of the hand writing of the defender, with which I am well acquainted, and being also shewn another letter, No. 6 of process, and dated Falkirk, 14 August* 1818, *and interrogated, depones and answers, I am also certain that this letter is of the hand writing of the defender, and being likewise shewn a note addressed Miss Pattison, Carlton Place, subscribed, C. Ure, and dated Wednesday morning, and interrogated, depones and answers, that note also is of the hand writing of the defender, and subscribed by her.*

Miss Pattison, the sister of Mr. Granville Sharpe Pattison, Surgeon in Glasgow, lived in Carlton Place of that city before the Whitsunday eighteen hundred and eighteen, and now in George's Square, of that city. I am not perfectly certain of the date when she, with her family, left Carlton Place and removed to George's Square. I speak from general recollection. Interrogated, depones and answers, I know both from his own information and from others, that Mr. Granville Sharpe Pattison went from Glasgow for Paris in April or May last, and remained in Paris during the greater part of the summer; and these letters and note foresaid, are accordingly subscribed by the deponent, and judge examinator, as relative hereto.

Interrogated, depones and answers. I did not see Mr. Pattison after he went away from Glasgow to go to Paris, as aforesaid, till October last, when I again saw him in Glasgow. I heard he had been in Britain for some time before, but I did not know this from my own knowledge. The report of his return reached me as a piece of professional news, and in reference to the circumstances, that he was a

lecturer on anatomy." Causa scientia patet. All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God.

As the said oaths and depositions, dated the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-sixth days of January, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, signed by such of the witnesses as could write, and by one of the said commissaries, bears.

At a calling of the cause, on the twenty-ninth day of the said month of January, the said Commissaries appointed the proof to proceed on the day following at eleven o'clock, and the said Richard Prentice, craved the Commissaries would grant diligence for citing the defender, and the Commissaries granted diligence accordingly. On the thirtieth day of the said month of January, at a quarter past eleven o'clock, the pursuer and his solicitor having both failed to attend or to give notice, the Commissaries discharged the diet, and fined the pursuer in five pounds sterling for this contempt of court, and prohibited the clerk from receiving any motion or paper which might be offered to be lodged in process on the part of the pursuer, till the fine should be paid to him, to be afterwards disposed of as the court should direct, as an interlocutor on the roll of process, signed by one of the said Commissaries bears.

The said Richard Prentice, while the said interlocutor was ingrossing, having appeared and stated, that he had been expecting the witnesses on the part of his client, the pursuer, and was himself in waiting to bring them forward upon their arrival, the Commissaries found that Mr. Prentice was in no respect personally to blame, and recalled the censure contained in the said interlocutor, in so far, as regarded him—and on the same day, the said Richard Prentice, for the pursuer, paid to the clerk, the fine of five pounds, and produced the following petition for the pursuer.

Humbly shewing, that in the action of divorce, at the pursuer's instance, against Catharine Monteath, his wife, this day, at eleven o'clock, was appointed for examining witnesses. But owing to the witnesses having to come from

Falkirk, they did not get forward in time to attend at the hour appointed, and the court having met agreeably to the appointment, and the witnesses not present, the pursuer was fined in the sum of five pounds, for contempt of court, and the receiving of any motion or paper on the part of the pursuer prohibited, till the fine was paid—that the witnesses have now arrived, and are in attendance, and the five pounds of fine had been paid,—wherefore, the pursuer prayed, it might please the Commissaries to recall the prohibition against receiving any motion or paper from the pursuer, and appoint the examination of the witnesses to proceed, and in respect of the circumstances, to ordain the fine to be repaid to the pursuer, or to do otherways as to this, as the Commissaries should think right, according to justice, and as the said petition, signed by the said Richard Prentice, bears: with which, the Commissaries made avizandum, and having considered the petition for the pursuer, they, by their interlocutor, dated the said thirtieth day of January, in respect that the witnesses had not been in fault, and that their detention in town, might be attended with injury to them, of new appoint, the proof to proceed at half past twelve this day, and reserve consideration of the petition, quoad ultra, as the said interlocutor bears.

Compeared Agnes Blair, spouse of William Mitchell, weaver, in Falkirk, aged thirty years, who being solemnly sworn kneeling and purged &c. ut supra, and interrogated, depones, that the defender Mrs. Ure, whom she knows by that name, and sees in court, came upon the twelfth of August last, to the deponent's house accompanied by Dr. Ure, (the pursuer) and he then took lodgings for her under the name of Mrs. Campbell, and she remained in these lodgings till about the middle of October last, and continued to bear the same name of Mrs. Campbell.* Depones that he brought

* This requires one word of explanation. Having strong grounds to suspect the chastity of his wife, though without legal evidence of her guilt, Dr. Ure separates from her, and with the full consent of her friends, places her at Falkirk, under an assumed name. That such a separation took place is shown by the positive testimony of Mrs. Ure herself, (Vid.

her to the deponent's house by the boat, and arrived about one o'clock, as she thinks, and left her, and returned by the boat that same afternoon, at four o'clock, for Glasgow—and the pursuer never afterwards came to the deponent's lodgings, while the defender staid there. Depones, that some short time after the defender's departure, and as the deponent thinks, rather more than a week, and perhaps some weeks, the pursuer did return to the deponent's lodgings, for the purpose of asking the deponent to go to Glasgow, with her servant, in order to ascertain whether a gentleman who had visited the defender, at the deponent's lodgings, about six days before she left these lodgings, was Dr. Granville Sharpe Pattison, Surgeon in Glasgow, depones, that she thinks that the defender left her lodgings in the deponent's house, upon the eighteenth or nineteenth of October, and she went away upon Wednesday, and the gentleman as to whom this enquiry was to be made, had visited the defender at the deponent's house on the Thursday before she went away. Interrogated. Depones and answers, "my servant Ann Simpson and I, did agree to go to Glasgow to ascertain this: my neighbour Mrs. Baird also went with us. According to Dr. Ure's direction we went to a house in George's Square, upon the door of which we found Dr. Pattison's name—we rung, and the servant answered, and we asked for Dr. Pattison:—we were told he was at home, and a gentleman who seemed to me the same I had seen at my house, visiting the defender, came to us as Dr. Pattison; Mrs. Baird in my presence then consulted him as Dr. Pattison upon a complaint she had in her breast, after which was over, we all went away. I do not mean to say, that from recollection of his appearance, without seeing him again, I could now swear that this gentleman whom we then saw as Dr. Pattison, at Glasgow, was the same person who had visited the defender in my house as aforesaid. But he was like, and I had no reason then to doubt, that he was the

p. 22, and 48 of these documents,) independently of the general notoriety of the fact—and it was Mr. Pattison's perseverance in the intrigue, after this separation, which determined the husband to apply for a divorce.

same person, and I still believe him to have been the same person. Interrogated—depones and answers—The gentleman above described as Dr. Pattison, came to my house about twelve o'clock of the day, and went into the kitchen where I was, and asked me for Mrs. Campbell,—he asked me first is this Mrs. Mitchell's house? I answered it was—he then said, is there one Mrs. Campbell here? I answered yes. He next inquired, is she at home? I answered she is. Upon my saying so, he next asked me, is there any person with her? I replied, nobody but the servant cleaning the room.—*He then went to her room without my showing him, as if he had been there before.* I did not go to the defender's room while he staid. The servant came down immediately, having left the room before it was cleaned, when he went there. I cannot say how long he staid, but I think it was about an hour afterwards, that my servant Ann Simpson, went up again to the room, and when she came back, she told me that he was away. Interrogated. Depones and answers, this gentleman gave himself no name, at this time, nor did I ask his name—I am certain he never had been in my house before. Interrogated. Depones and answers, When Dr. Ure came to my house, after the defender had left it, as aforesaid, he inquired if any person had been calling upon her, while she staid? I told him a lady whose name I did not know, and whom I described, and he called her Mrs. Park: a young gentleman whom she called her cousin, but whose name I did not then know, and have never heard—and the other gentleman whom I described to him, and from my description, he desired me to go to Glasgow, as aforesaid, with my servant and Mrs. Baird, to see if it was Dr. Pattison. These three were the only persons I remember, who visited the defender at my house, and they came to see her not together, but singly, and at different times. Interrogated. Depones and answers, " the defender's lodgings at my house consisted of a parlour and bedroom behind entering from the parlour, in which she slept. It was the parlour my servant was cleaning when Dr. Pattison called for the defender as aforesaid." Interrogated.

Depones and answers, the stair to the defender's lodging is in the middle of my house, I mean the front stair, the lowest step of that stair is just at the kitchen door. I was keeping my child in the kitchen and the door of the kitchen was open from the time that Mr. Pattison went up to the defender's room, to the time that my servant went up to that room again, and came down, and told me that he was gone, as aforesaid. I am certain he did not come down by the front stair, and go by the front door, otherwise I must have seen him. But there was a back stair, entering to the same story, in which the defender lodged, from the outside of the house; and he must have gone away by that back stair. Interrogated. Depones and answers, a few days after the defender came to lodge at my house, Ann Simpson, my servant, went with her to the post office to dispatch a letter, when they came back they told me that the letter was to Paris, and the defender not having money enough of her own to pay the postage of the letter to Dover, as demanded by the post master, got some money of mine from my servant to make up the postage; I think it was two shillings and two-pence half-penny in all. They were laughing and talking of the defender's quarrelling with the post master about the postage, which she thought was too much. I did not hear to whom the defender's letter was addressed, nor did I ask, my servant could not read writing. Interrogated. Depones and answers, the young gentleman whom the defender called her cousin, came to my house to see her about two weeks after this letter was dispatched. I never asked, nor heard his name. I think I would know him again. Interrogated. Depones and answers, the defender said she had paid letters to the same place (Paris) both from Glasgow, and Edinburgh, and the postage never was so much as two shillings and two-pence half-penny, causa scientia patet, all which, is truth as the deponent shall answer to God.

Ann Simpson, servant to the preceding witness, aged sixteen years, and not married, who being solemnly sworn kneeling and purged, &c. ut supra, and interrogated, depones and answers, while the lady whom I have now seen in

Court, as the defender Mrs. Ure, staid in the house of my mistress Mrs. Mitchell, at Falkirk, last harvest; she was called Mrs. Campbell. Interrogated, depones and answers, she took me with her one day soon after she came, to show her the post office—she had a letter to France, and the post master asked more for the postage than she had to pay in her pocket. I think it was about two shillings and two-pence half-penny. I had some money of my mistresses and lent her the rest. We told my mistress when we came back. I do not know to whom the letter was addressed, and cannot read writing. Interrogated, depones and answers, about a week before she went away, I was in Mrs. Ure's room to clean it, when a gentleman came in to see her—he said how do you do to-day ma'am. They shook hands and seemed glad to see each other. I do not remember what she said. I went down stairs, and as I came away from the room, she and the gentleman went out by the back stair towards the garden: some time afterwards, she chapped for me on the floor, of her room, I went up, she and the gentleman were then standing at the window; she bade me set by the things, I put two chairs in their places, that were standing on the floor and went down again, leaving them together. I went up again, after one o'clock with the things for her dinner which she commonly got at that hour, and dressed for herself. She was not in—I supposed she had gone out with the gentleman—I went down again, and when I came up in a little afterwards to her room she was there alone. Interrogated, depones and answers, I did not then know who that gentleman was, but I went some time afterwards with my mistress and Mrs. Baird, to see. We went to Dr. Pattison's at Glasgow, and called for him. He came to us, and told Mrs. Baird what to do with the breast which was sore. Dr. Pattison was the gentleman who had come into Mrs. Ure's room when I was cleaning it. I am quite certain she was the same person.—Interrogated, depones and answers, Mrs. Ure had a closet with a bed entering from her parlour, and in which she slept.—Interrogated, depones and answers, Dr. Pattison must have gone away by the back door from Mrs. Ure's

lodging at Falkirk, otherwise I must have seen him go away. Causa scientia patet.—All which is truth, as the deponent shall answer to God. Depones she cannot write.

Christian Sterling, wife of James Baird, residing in Falkirk, aged forty years, who being solemnly sworn kneeling, &c. and purged, &c. ut supra, and interrogated, depones and answers, while the defender whom I have seen this day in court, lived at Mrs. Mitchell's lodgings in Falkirk, last harvest, her parlour and bed closet were on the same floor with my house. I remember one day seeing a gentleman with her: I had gone to wash the back stair. From the stair head I saw her in the garden, with this gentleman. I was astonished. I had never seen her with a gentleman before: she called up to me, and asked, if the servant had cleaned out her room. I looked, and told her it was not cleaned out. The gentleman took her by the shoulders, and said to her, never heed. He opened the garden gate, and she went up the stair, and he after her to her room. All I heard of their conversation was, him saying to her, I saw your sister yesterday, and her answering, is she well, to which he replied, yes.—Interrogated, depones and answers, I saw no more of them while they were together. About one hour after this, I was at the back of the town, and I saw him coming as from the back of our house, and go to the boat for Glasgow.—Interrogated, depones and answers, after the defender left Mrs. Mitchell's lodgings, Dr. Ure applied to me to go with Mrs. Mitchell, and her servant Ann Simpson, to Glasgow, in order to ascertain if Dr. Granville Sharpe Pattison was the same person I had seen with the defender as aforesaid. I agreed to do so, and to consult Dr. Pattison about a complaint I had in my breast. We went to Dr. Pattison's house in George's Square, Glasgow. His mother answered the door, and told us he was at home, and showed us into the room where he was. I consulted him as Dr. Pattison—he answered to that name—and gave me his advice, before Mrs. Mitchell and Ann Simpson. He also prescribed for me in writing. I am certain, both from his speech and appearance, that he was the

very same person I had seen with the defender at Falkirk as aforesaid.—Interrogated, depones and exhibits the written prescription, which is subscribed by the Judge Examinator as relative hereto.—Interrogated, depones and answers, I saw him write that prescription. Interrogated, depones and answers, Dr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure were standing very close together, and face to face, upon the walk of the garden when I saw them from the stair head as aforesaid. Causa scientia patet—all which is the truth as the deponent shall answer to God.—Depones she cannot write.

As the said oaths and depositions, dated the thirtieth day of January, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, and signed by such of the witnesses as could write, and by one of the said Commissaries bears.

Follows the written prescription referred to in Christian Sterling's deposition: ℞ Pelut. assafœted. No. xxiv Signa. Two to be taken every night at bed time. ℞ Super Carbon Potass ℥ Tere et divide in dozes ag xx Signa. *Stomachic powders*, one to be taken every morning 1-2 hour after breakfast, and another as long before dinner.

The Commissaries, on the said thirtieth day of January, held the proof as concluded, and made avizandum, and having resumed consideration of the petition for the pursuer, they by their interlocutor, dated the fifth day of February, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, in respect of the explanation therein, recalled the interlocutor imposing a fine of five pounds on the pursuer, and authorized the clerk to return the same to the pursuer or his solicitor, as said interlocutor bears: and having considered the *proof adduced, writings produced, and whole process, they, by their other interlocutor, dated the said fifth day of February one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, found facts, circumstances and qualifications proved, relevant to infer, the defender's guilt of Adultery with Granville Sharpe Pattison, mentioned in the proof, found her guilty of Adultery with him accordingly, therefore, divorced and separated*, found and declared in terms of the conclusion of the libel, and de-

cerned. As the said interlocutor, reported in court, on the day of the date thereof extant in process bears.

At a calling of the cause, on the twelfth day of February one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, Archibald Scott and Thomas Rymer, solicitors at law in Edinburgh, produced mandate from the said Catharine Monteath, defender, dated the said fifth day of February, whereby she appointed them her agents to defend her in an action of divorce then depending in the Commissary Court, at the instance of Dr. Andrew Ure, of Glasgow, her husband, against her, and authorized them to take such steps therein, as they should see cause, and the said Archibald Scott at the same time produced the two following petitions for the said Catharine Monteath, the one humbly showing, That in an action of divorce at the instance of the said Dr. Andrew Ure, against the defender, the Commissaries upon the fifth of February current, pronounced the following interlocutor: the Commissaries having considered the proof adduced, writings produced, and whole process, find facts, circumstances and qualifications proved, relevant to infer, the defender's guilt of Adultery, with Granville Sharpe Pattison, mentioned in the proof—finds her guilty of Adultery with him accordingly, therefore, divorce, separate, find and declare, in terms of the conclusion of the libel and decern. That this decree was pronounced in the absence of the defender, and without any compearance having been made for her, she having been studiously kept in ignorance of the nature of the proceedings, that were instituted against her—that from motives which would be brought to light by the result of the present action, the pursuer and his agents, by falsehood and artifice, excluded her from the benefit of professional assistance, and induced her to believe, that arrangements were making for her advantage, and that if she followed her advice, she should soon be restored to her husband, and her children—that under their assurances she was restrained from communicating with any individual, upon the subject of the domestic quarrel between herself and the pursuer, and was even induced to appear before the

Commissaries for the purpose, as she had since been informed, of being identified by certain witnesses who were examined at the instance of her husband—That the defender, thus led to confide in the pursuer's agents, was totally ignorant of the highly injurious proceedings that were carried on against her, until she was informed that the Commissaries had pronounced the interlocutor above quoted—That, conscious of her innocence, she was determined to resist to the utmost an action in itself unfounded, and in its conduct so injurious and illegal. For this purpose, she craved to be reponed against the decree, and to be allowed a proof of all facts and circumstances, that may tend to exculpate her from the crime of which she was accused.

But as preliminary to, and exclusive of any inquiry into the merits of her general defence, the defender stated, as a sufficient ground of absolvitor, in the present action of divorce, the plea of remissio injuriæ.

The defender averred, and craved the Commissaries' permission to prove, that for a considerable period after the pursuer accused her of the acts of adultery, and after he was in possession of the whole evidence on which he founds in his action of divorce, he continued to cohabit with her, and more particularly, that he slept with her on more than on one occasion, after having expressed his firm belief of her alleged criminality, and after having testified this pretended conviction, by taking measures for her removal from his family. The defender, confident that the pursuer would not venture to deny the truth of this statement, craved, that before entering upon the proof of it, the Commissaries should order him to be judicially examined upon the point, and therefore praying it might please the Commissaries to recal the interlocutor complained of, and to repone the defender against the same, and the whole proceedings in absence;—to allow her to prove all facts and circumstances, that may tend to exculpate her from the crimes with which she was charged—to find her allegation as to the remissio injuriæ relevant perse, to elide the conclusions of the libel—

to allow her a proof of the same, and primo loco, to order the said pursuer to appear and be judicially examined before the Commissaries, as to whether after being in the knowledge of her pretended guilt he continued to cohabit with the defender, and other facts pertinent to that point, according to justice, &c. as the said petition, bearing to be drawn by Mr. Alexander Monteath, Advocate, and signed by the defender and the said Thomas Rymer, bears.

The other of the said petitions humbly shewing, that the petitioner's husband had thought proper to raise a process of divorce on the head of adultery against her, and which is presently depending before the Commissaries. That this action was ill founded, and the defender had good grounds of defence, which were submitted to the Commissaries in the petition for her lodged this day. That the pursuer *separated from the defender on the twelfth of August last*, and has not supplied her with money for her support. That on the second of December last, the defender was delivered of a female child to the pursuer, but he had not paid the expense attending her accouchement, or for the nursing of the child, &c. That by the law of this country, the pursuer of a divorce against his wife, was not only bound to supply the defender with aliment, but also, money to defray the expense of her defence against such action, and the Commissaries were uniformiy in the practice of ordaining sufficient sums to be paid for these purposes. The pursuer has an income of five hundred pounds sterling per annum, and the defender humbly craved, that the Commissaries would ordain him to pay her an aliment for herself, at the rate of one hundred pounds per annum, payable half yearly per advance; also twenty pounds as inlying charges, and thirty pounds sterling per annum of aliment to the child, payable half yearly, per advance,—likewise, to decern him to pay fifty pounds sterling to the defender or her solicitor, towards defraying the expense of her defence, and therefore, praying it might please the Commissaries to take the premises under consideration, and decern and ordain the pursuer to pay to the defender an yearly aliment of one hundred pounds, pay-

able half yearly, per advance, commencing the first half year's payment, as on the said twelfth August last, and so on half yearly till the issue of this cause, with the lawful interest of each half year's aliment, from the time it falls due, and till paid,—also, to decern and ordain him to pay her the sum of twenty pounds, as inlying expenses, and thirty pounds sterling of aliment to the said child, payable half yearly, per advance, commencing the first half yearly payment as on the said second of December last, and so on, half yearly thereafter, aye, and until he shall receive the said child into his own proper family, with the lawful interest of each half year's aliment, from the time it falls due, and till paid: and further, to decern and ordain him to make payment to the defender, or her solicitors, the sum of fifty pounds sterling, towards defraying the expense of her defence, besides the dues of extracting a decreet or decreets, or to decern for such other sums as to the Commissaries may seem meet, according to justice, and as the said petition, signed by the said defender, and by the said Thomas Rymer, bears: which petition, the said Richard Prentice received to see.

At another calling of the cause, on the fifth day of March one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, the said Richard Prentice gave in the following answers for the said Dr. Andrew Ure, pursuer, to the petitions for the said Catharine Monteath, defender, bearing: That the tardy appearance of the defender in the present divorce where the proof had been concluded, and found sufficient by the Commissaries, required explanation, and would no doubt be strictly investigated by the Commissaries, before they allowed the unfortunate defender to state a defence, which there was no room to doubt she was compelled to make by the most improper means and undue influence. The fact was, that no sooner was the interlocutor of divorce pronounced, and known in Glasgow, than the person with whom the adultery had been found proved by the Commissaries, came to Edinburgh, where the *defender, through his influence, and that of others acting with him, and under whose care and protection she was*

living, was beset and forced to go into all his views and measures, and in order to this, the mandate was dictated to her, and allowance given, to state whatever defence, and take whatever steps which might suit her views: and the commencement of the proceedure plainly showed, that one, not the least of the objects intended, was to create a ruinous expense, and a procrastinated discussion. The pursuer could easily prove this statement of undue influence by an *examination of Mr. Pattison, and those who acted for him, as well as the fact, that they instantly removed the defender from the place where she had resided under their charge, and refused to communicate to her anxious friends the retreat which they had provided for her*, no doubt an excusable alarm, that she would avow at once their interference, and expose the means adopted to make her subservient to the purposes intended, when her paternal uncle, Doctor Monteath, a most respectable gentleman in Glasgow, after decree of divorce had been pronounced, came to Edinburgh to the defender, and after several days search and every attempt was unsuccessful, two ladies, her only maternal relations, after many days, importunately, with those, who had, or were in the knowledge of her removal, at length recovered her, only by a regular but improper capitulation, in which the terms imposed were, that none of her relations should be permitted to see her without her own previous consent; during the period of her confinement and concealment, the petitions now under answer were prepared—and how opposite to her real wishes and sentiments, was evident from the fact, that *the moment she recovered her liberty*, she made a full confession to these ladies, of her *guilty intercourse with the person referred to in the proof, and of the child born in Edinburgh, not being her husband's.*—The defender herself, would, no doubt, ante omnia, be ordained to appear before the Commissaries, in order to explain the matter in which she gave the mandate, which had been produced, and to say whether her appearance be voluntary, and such, as she abided by. The pursuer was assured from most respectable information, that her declaration upon this point would not only be most interesting, but

would expose the most *reprehensible artifices to influence an unfortunate victim to make an unfounded defence and aggravate the sufferings of her injured husband.* The pursuer had heard from the defender's own relations, that she was ignorant of the contents of the petitions now under answer, and that she signed the same as a matter of course, by the directions of those under whose control she was, and without knowing what she was about, and that she would admit this when judicially examined. It would be premature for the pursuer, in these circumstances, now to enter into the merits of the case—he would be most ready to do so, as soon as he was sensible, that the defender, uninfluenced, and of her own free will and accord, wished to defend the action, but he would content himself, at present, with denying the plea of remissio, and when the Commissaries recollected that the proof referred to dates subsequent to his separation from the defender, it was thought they would not be inclined to attach much credit to the allegation on this head, nor would they be induced to regard the statement made against the pursuer, and his agents, when they considered, *that the defender for long before, and ever since the divorce was instituted, had lived under the protection and entire control of her seducer, and those employed by him.* Neither need the pursuer, it was presumed, speak to the absurd and extravagant demands for aliment, &c. until the preliminary objection to the defender's appearance be disposed of, and her examination takes place. On the whole, therefore, the pursuer humbly submitted, that before farther procedure, the Commissaries ought to probe to the bottom, this improper and undue influence, by a judicial examination of the defender, and those upon whom she should in her declaration condescend, as having influenced her from improper purposes, now to state a defence in this action, which it was too apparent, she never otherwise would have done,—and must be satisfied, there was no ground for. In respect whereof and as the said answer signed by the said Richard Prentice bear with which the Commissaries made avizandum, and having considered the petition for the defender first, herein en-

grossed, with the answers thereto, they by their interlocutor, dated the twelfth day of the said month of March, before farther procedure, appointed the defender to appear in court to be judicially examined, whether she of her own free will granted the mandate in process, and whether, or not, she now authorized the appearance made for her in this action, as the said interlocutor bears: and the Commissaries by minute on the roll of process of the same date, assigned the then next court-day, for the defender to appear and be judicially examined.

At another calling of the cause, on the nineteenth day of the said month of March, the defender was called, and failed to appear,—when William Pollock, Solicitor at Law, in Edinburgh, appeared and stated: That he had received a letter from the defender, enclosing a certificate, under the hands of a surgeon, of her being indisposed, and not able to attend in court that day,—also an affidavit by the defender, emitted before a justice of the peace, which he produced, and are of the following tenor.

Port Glasgow, 17 March, 1819.—This is to certify, that I have attended Mrs. Ure for the last four weeks, and that her present state of health is not such, as to render it prudent or safe to travel to Edinburgh. On soul and conscience, (Signed) W. Crawford, Surgeon.

Port Glasgow, 9 March, 1819.—Messrs. Scott and Rymer, Solicitors, Edin. Gentlemen,—*I was sometime induced at the solicitation of Mr. Burn*, acting as agent for Mr. *Granville Sharpe Pattison*, to sign a mandate addressed to you, authorizing opposition to be made in my name, to a decree of divorce obtained against me by my husband, Dr. Ure. I was induced to do so under assurances, *that it was for my interest in the way of obtaining an aliment and permission to see my children at pleasure.* But I now find *that I have been deceived*, and I accordingly hereby recall every mandate I may have granted, authorizing you to present a petition in my name, opposing the divorce obtained by my husband, or for aliment to myself, or my child, or for a sum to defray expenses, and I *solemnly disavow and retract the*

injurious and unfounded expressions contained in the petitions presented to the Commissaries of Edinburgh in my name, *many of which expressions, I was unconscious of from not having read the petitions*, and I do therefore hereby require, that the petitions presented in my name be instantly withdrawn from the process and cancelled. I am, &c.

At Port Glasgow, the seventeenth day of March, eighteen hundred and nineteen years, in presence of Robert Mc Lauchlan, esquire, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace, for the County of Renfrew, compeared Mrs. Catharine Monteath, spouse of Dr. Andrew Ure, of Glasgow, who being solemnly sworn and examined, depones, that she, on the ninth day of March current, wrote and addressed a letter of which the prefixed is a true copy, to Messrs. Scott and Rymer, Solicitors, Edinburgh; that the deponent did *so of her own free will and motive*, and was *in no wise seduced, or compelled to do so by her husband or any of his friends, nor was the same done from any collusion*, that on the contrary, the deponent did so, from a conviction, *that truth and justice required*, that she should write such a letter, and she now accordingly *upon oath, adhered to it:* all which is truth as the deponent shall answer to God, signed, Catharine Ure, Rob Mc Lauchlan, J. P.

With which the Commissaries made avizandum, and having considered the Surgeon's certificate, and affidavit of the defender, in which she withdrew her appearance in this action, they, by their interlocutor, dated the twenty-sixth day of March, one thousand eight hundred and nineteen years, the last date hereof, recalled the order for the defender's judicial examination, and dispensed with her attendance,—and having resumed consideration of both petitions for her, with answers thereto, and whole process, refused the desire of the said petitions, and adhered to the interlocutor of the fifth of February last, as the said interlocutor duly reported in court, on the day of the date thereof bears: and so, the said Commissaries gave and pronounced their sentence and decreet in the aforesaid matter, finding,

divorcing, separating, declaring, and decerning, in manner at length before written.

Extracted, upon this, and the one hundred and fourteen preceding pages, by

GEORGE CARPHIN, Jun. *Subs't.*

As an Analysis may be useful in bringing distinctly into view the more important matters spread through these documents, the following is submitted.

I. Dr. Andrew Ure, a physician of Glasgow, intermarried with Catharine Monteath, in the month of December, 1807—and from that period, until the year 1818, they lived together as man and wife, in perfect harmony with each other, and in good estimation with their neighbours—he holding a distinguished rank in his profession. These facts appear, not only from the negative evidence of there being no allegation or proof to the contrary, but from positive and uncontradicted testimony. They had several children. The time of the marriage is stated on the first page of the documents, and the earliest suspicion he appears to have had of the infidelity of his wife, occurred (p. 16.) in the latter part of the year 1818.

That Mrs. Ure had a kind husband and a happy home, is proved by her own declaration, (p. 21.) that her misfortunes, that is, her connexion with Mr. Pattison, had separated her "from one of the best and most indulgent husbands, and from her dear, dear children."—And also (p. 35.) by her letter of the 23d October, 1818, in which she speaks with agony of the time since she left "her family."—The estimation in which Dr. Ure stood as a physician and a man in Glasgow, may be justly inferred, from the professorship he held in a respectable medical establishment, (p. 23, 24.)—the lectures he delivered there, and the income derived (p. 48.) from his professional labours.

II. It is shown, (p. 23, 24.) that in the year 1817, and how much earlier does not appear, Mr. Pattison "often visited in Dr. Ure's house"—and we may safely aver, that

he visited as a friend and intimate of the Doctor's—and that this intimacy was of more than ordinary kindness, may also be inferred from the circumstance, (p. 27.) that when a party was given by a friend of Mr. Pattison, upon account of his going to Paris, Dr. and Mrs. Ure were of the party, and Mrs. Ure was to go in Mr. Pattison's carriage.

III. It appears that Mr. Pattison made his visits to Mrs. Ure, when her husband was out—and particularly when it was known he would be lecturing—making pretences for coming oftener than might otherwise seem proper to the servants; and it is clear, that on these visits, he was engaged in some sort of conversation or intercourse with Mrs. Ure, which made her face "dyed up red" when discovered—and caused her to look "flurried and not as usual."—See pages 24, 25, 27, 28, 29. "He sometimes called twice or thrice in one day, and twice the apology was, that he had left his handkerchief," (p. 29.) "His calls for Mrs. Ure were frequent, and very often made at the hours, when Dr. Ure was lecturing at the Institution—and were also made on the days when he was absent at Greenock," (p. 30.) In all this evidence, there can be clearly seen a deliberate, cautious and persevering system of seduction, practised upon the wife of his friend, until the object was accomplished, the victim ruined, and the friend dishonoured.

IV. That this object was finally accomplished, and an adulterous intercourse kept up between Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure, in the house of her husband, as well as at other places, is put beyond all question, not only by the strongest circumstantial evidence, but by the unequivocal declarations of Mrs. Ure herself, in a letter addressed to Mr. Pattison, (p. 21.) intended for his perusal only, with no view either to his condemnation or her's. The sole object is to awaken his compassion for the victim he had destroyed, and to implore "the author of all her misfortunes," to relieve her from "misery and want." The authenticity of this letter is directly proved, and no where questioned—and it exhibits the shocking spectacle of the wife of a respectable man, the

mother of "dear, dear children," seduced from her husband and family—lost even in her own estimation—and then abandoned to the sufferings of actual want—and fearful of being "allowed to starve to death, and not a creature to look on her." To add to the horror and disgust of the picture, the poor, guilty, deserted creature is at that moment pregnant by the man she thus beseeches to save her from starvation. (p. 22.)

V. There is no evidence from which it can be, even remotely, inferred, that Mrs. Ure, prior to her connexion with Mr. Pattison, had stepped from the path of virtue—or brought a stain upon her reputation. The contrary appears in several ways.

1. From her being of a select party to tea and supper (p. 27.) given by a friend of Mr. Pattison, whose respectability, it is presumed, he will not impeach, and who would not thus receive and entertain a woman of tainted character.

2. From the very great intimacy which existed between her and the whole of his family, and with Miss Pattison especially, an *unmarried sister*, the endearing epithets of "My dear Miss Pattison," and "My dear Mrs. Ure," being employed in the letters which passed between them. (p. 36.)

3. Her previous purity may, in a considerable degree, be assumed from the agitation and confusion she betrayed when discovered in some of her familiarities with Mr. Pattison—and which would hardly be found in an abandoned woman. But the evidence that she was not a shameless and hardened creature, is especially to be found in her two letters, (p. 21. 34.) in which she poured out the whole flood of her feelings—and in which there is a tone of remaining delicacy, and a spirit of repentance and agony, (p. 22.) wholly inconsistent with careless and hardened guilt.

VI. The documents show undeniably that the case was not secretly or hastily examined or decided—but with ample caution and deliberation, by a highly respectable tribu-

nal, whose impartiality and ability cannot be impeached. The proceedings commenced on the second of December, on which day the defender, Mrs. Ure, had full notice of the charge, and was duly summoned to appear and answer it. With this summons she also received "the names and designation of the witnesses," (p. 17.) to be produced against her. Dr. Ure is compelled to make oath, (p. 20.) "that there has been no concert or collusion between him and the said defender, in raising this action in order to obtain a divorce against her." The evidence produced is carefully and scrupulously examined—and if confidence and faith are to be given to the proceedings and judgment of any court, this seems to be entitled to them. On the 30th of January, 1819, (p. 45.) the proof is concluded—and on the fifth of February, more than two months from the commencement of the process, the Court "having considered the proof adduced, writings produced, and whole process," find and pronounce Mrs. Ure guilty of adultery with Granville Sharpe Pattison. (p. 45.)

VII. A few days after the decree, to wit, on the twelfth day of February, certain solicitors at law produce a mandate from Mrs. Ure, dated on the day of the decree, appointing them agents to defend her—(p. 45.) and present two petitions from her. (p. 32.) In one of them she alleges the decree was pronounced in her absence, she having been kept in ignorance of the nature of the proceedings—accuses her husband of falsehood and artifice in relation to them—avers her innocence, and prays to be allowed to make proof to exculpate herself. She then charges her husband with having cohabited with her after he had accused her of adultery. The other petition demands alimony and support from her husband—although in her letter (p. 22.) she says, "I have no claim upon my husband: that is now over." On the fifth of March following, (p. 49.) the cause is called again—When Dr. Ure's solicitor gives in his answer to these petitions—in which he expressly charges Mr. Pattison with having, by himself and his agents, influenced and

forced Mrs. Ure, she being under their care and protection, to give the mandate, (p. 49.) and allow of the defence and steps taken in her name. Dr. Ure offers to prove this "statement of under influence by *an examination of Mr. Pattison and those who acted for him.*" He charges, that they removed her from her friends, so that they could not communicate with her, lest she should expose their conduct—and that the moment she recovered her liberty, she made a full confession of her guilt with Mr. Pattison. (p. 50.) He wishes Mrs. Ure to be examined on this point. He accuses Mr. Pattison of having used the "most reprehensible artifices to influence an unfortunate victim to make an unfounded defence, and aggravate the sufferings of an injured husband." And further, "that the defender, for a long time before, and ever since the divorce was instituted, had lived under the protection and entire control of her seducer and those employed by him." (p. 51.) For the truth of all this, he puts himself upon the examinations of Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure. *No such examinations were ever tendered by them.* But on the 19th of March, a letter is produced in court, (p. 52.) written by Mrs. Ure, in which she fully confirms the statement made by Dr. Ure—and exposes the artifices and deceptions used by Mr. Burn, acting as agent for Mr. Pattison, to induce her to sign the mandate. This letter is addressed to the solicitors to whom the mandate had been directed. The truth of the charges contained against Mr. Pattison, in this letter, nor of those made by Dr. Ure, appears never afterwards to have been denied or questioned. Neither Mr. Pattison, nor his agent Mr. Burn, have ever given any explanation or contradiction of those accusations of fraud, falsehood, and force. They have never called upon Dr. Ure to answer for them as slanderous and unfounded. They have not even, by a voluntary examination, appealed to by Dr. Ure, denied their guilt—but have silently retreated from the controversy, and submitted to the charge. The letter of Mrs. Ure was accompanied by her oath—that it was written

by herself, of her own free will and motive—being neither seduced nor compelled by her husband or his friends. The fraudulent petitions were dismissed—and the decree which pronounced Mrs. Ure guilty of adultery with Granville Sharpe Pattison, remains in full force.

P. S. In the estimate which I had formed of the character of the "gentlemen of Baltimore, who incautiously, on a statement entirely *ex parte*, vindicated by a certificate, the innocence of Mr. Pattison," I was deceived.* They have, in despite of the appeal made to their honour, and of the new and distinct light shed on the affair, by the authentic evidence in the preceding official documents, adhered to their former decision—and with a view of protecting the same individual, have caused the fact to be published. It therefore becomes my duty, however reluctant I may be, to show that these gentlemen have acted unworthily, and that their opinion though so solemnly delivered, is entitled to only, and precisely the same weight, as the representations of their friend Mr. Pattison himself.

The question will naturally be asked by every one, why did they take on themselves this invidious office? As the charge against Mr. Pattison had been a matter of legal investigation, what could be, were he innocent, more easy than his exculpation? Why was not the precise case on which the court acted, that convicted him, laid before the public, and their corruption, or the insufficiency of the evidence, by which they were governed, exposed?

Choosing, however, for any reason, to assume jurisdiction in the case, did not common decency, independently of more sacred obligations, require, that all the facts should have been placed before them? Desirous of the establishment of truth, and the dispensation of equal and exact justice,

* Vide Preface to the Documents, page 9.

would they have not called on the accuser to make out and substantiate his allegations? No invitation is made of this nature. Every part of the complainant's case is, on the contrary, kept back, and they proceed, *ex cathedra*, to the delivery of their decision, without hearing, or even soliciting, one tittle of criminatory evidence!

Nor is this, by any means, the least reprehensible part of their conduct. To allow the culprit to escape with impunity, a lengthened catalogue of documents is imposed on the public, which have no bearing on the immediate charge, and hardly the remotest relation to the subject.

Even here, concealment would seem to be designed. The documents, for the most part, are enumerated, not given *in extenso*, lest their real character and import might appear. Examined carefully, it will be found, that of the whole of this parade of papers there are, indeed, only two, which can be considered as in the slightest degree exculpatory, *and these are allowed to be printed at length.*

CERTIFICATE.

Being requested by Granville Sharpe Pattison, Esq. Professor of Surgery in the University of Maryland, to examine a series of Letters and Documents, relative to the causes of his coming to the United States, with the view of becoming Professor of Anatomy in the University of Pennsylvania; and also in relation to a charge made against him by Dr. Andrew Ure, of Glasgow;—the undersigned examined said letters and documents, and are satisfied, 1st, That said letters and documents are genuine, and were written and made at the *time*, and in the *manner*, they respectfully profess to be; and, 2dly, *That the charge of adulterous intercourse between Mr. Pattison and Mrs. Ure, is wholly destitute of foundation.*

The letters and documents examined by us, are as follows:

1st. Letters from John Pattison, Esq. of Philadelphia, to Granville S. Pattison, Esq. of Glasgow, of the following dates: 17th November, 1818; 8th and 14th January, 1819;

23d, 25th, and 26th March, 1819; 14th, 17th, and 20th April, 1819.

2d. Letter from Granville Sharpe Pattison, Glasgow, to John Pattison, Philadelphia, 20th February, 1819.

3d. Letter of Sir William Adams, London, to G. S. Pattison, 26th May, 1819.

4th. Letter from Dr. W. P. Dewees, Philadelphia, to G. S. Pattison, 20th April, 1819.

5th. Letter from Sir James M'Gregor, London, to Dr. Francis, New-York, 28th May, 1819.

6th. Letter from Dr. Barclay to Dr. Mease, Philadelphia, 19th May, 1819.

7th. Letter from David Walker, Esq. of Philadelphia, then in Glasgow, to John Pattison, Esq. of Philadelphia, 30th March, 1819.

8th. Letter from Mr. John Scott, Glasgow, to G. S. Pattison, 10th March, 1819.

9th. Letter from Alexander Stevens, Glasgow, to G. S. Pattison, 10th March, 1819.

10th. Fac simile of a letter from Dr. Andrew Ure, to *Catharine Ure*, 12th Oct. 1818.

11th. *Reclaiming petition of Catharine Ure*, 12th February, 1819.

12th. Glasgow newspapers, 6th and 27th March, 1819, containing Granville S. Pattison's advertisement, relative to his pamphlet, and calling on Dr. Ure and his wife to exhibit their charge and evidence.

13th. Granville S. Pattison's pamphlet, repelling Dr. Ure's charge; read publicly in Glasgow, 26th March, 1819.*

R. SMITH,
JOHN M. DUNCAN,
W. H. WINDER,
A. NISBET.

* These then, are the documents on which the judgment of the *self-created* tribunal of Baltimore decided. Let them be contrasted with the real evidence in the case.

What, however, I wish particularly to call attention to, as of a still higher tone of culpability, is the studious suppression of evidence which has been practised in the case. The *reclaiming petition* of Mrs. Ure, in which the guilt of her husband is set forth in the strongest colours, is included among the documents, while *her letter to the court, accompanied by an oath that it was "written by herself of her own free will and motive," denying the truth of the contents of the reclaimer, and that it was signed by her without being aware of its purport, through the artifices of Mr. Pattison's agents, is withheld.**

Exactly of the same character is their conduct in relation to the celebrated letter purporting to be from Dr. Ure to his wife, in the assertion of its genuineness. An inquiry is here suggested as to the degree and kind of evidence on which this opinion was formed. Excepting the simple declaration of the *party interested*, I do aver, and challenge contradiction, that they proceeded on grounds wholly gratuitous. No one of these individuals was acquainted with the hand-writing of Dr. Ure, and they came to this hasty and unwarrantable conclusion against all intrinsic probability, merely from a *fac simile* furnished by Mr. Pattison himself, with no standard of comparison, or any other just rule of determination.

That this most infamous letter is the fabrication of Mr. Pattison, for the diabolical purpose of destroying the reputation of his patron and friend Dr. Ure, is shown by evidence which cannot be resisted. The letter bears date the 12th October, 1818; and it appears from the testimony of one of the witnesses on the trial, as well as by the confession of Mrs. Ure herself, that a separation had taken place between her and her husband on the 12th August previous.†

Can we, therefore, independently of all other improbabilities, for one moment suppose, that a correspondence of this, or any other description, should, under these circum-

* The reader will not permit this circumstance to escape. He will find the papers referred to in p. 45, 46, and 47, of the Documents.

† Vide Documents, p. 39 and 48.

stances, have been carried on between the parties? What possible motive can be assigned for his addressing such a letter to her, with whom he had ceased to have any intercourse, and who indeed could hardly be considered any longer his wife? Even stronger proof however is afforded by the fact, that the letter was never brought to light, till after the completion of the trial! During the pendency of the case, Mrs. Ure, as appears from the documents, was concealed from her friends by Mr. Pattison, and subjected entirely to his control, why then was not the letter produced, which, at once, must have silenced the allegations of Dr. Ure, and to use the legal phrase, "*turn'd him out of court!*" The reason obviously is, that had this been done, its genuineness would have been canvassed by a *competent tribunal*, and the fabrication detected. But how did the letter ultimately come to light? When questioned on the subject, Mr. Pattison tells Dr. Physick and Dr. Dewees, as well as others in this city, that it was given by Mrs. Ure to Mr. Jeffrey, his lawyer, on an express condition that he should become her paramour! Where is the testimony of Mr. Jeffrey to this fact? What, however, is conclusive, on the appearance of the letter, Mrs. Ure gave a certificate on oath that it was *spurious*. Though this document is not now in my possession, I can procure it, and shall be prepared to show, when necessary, that the letter was a fabrication of Mr. Pattison and his friend Mr. Burn, and subsequently, that by their machinations, this miserably degraded woman was led to the *commission of perjury*, for their exculpation. That they were capable of a conspiracy of this sort, independently of other evidence, who can doubt, when their conduct is adverted to in relation to the "Reclaiming Petition," an act, in every view, not less enormously wicked.*

As to the charge of *adultery with Mrs. Ure*, I deem it sufficiently established, by the decision of the legal tribunal, which tried the case. But since the "gentlemen who look-

* The reader is particularly requested to turn to the account of this transaction. Vide Documents, p. 52. For the character of Mr. Burn, consult p. 22, of the Documents.

ed over the documents," still avow their unaltered conviction, of its being "wholly unfounded," it is proper I should state, for the benefit of those who may in any degree be influenced by their authority, that I can command the testimony of three of the most respectable of our citizens to prove that *Mr. Pattison himself confessed, on his first arrival in this country, that he had carried on an intrigue, the details of which were mentioned, with this unhappy woman, and on comparison of dates, it will be found, at the very time when she was most intimate with the females of his family, and especially with an unmarried sister.*

Of the import of the preceding charges I am fully aware, and have not preferred them unadvisedly. The evidence by which they are sustained has been accurately scanned, and with that already presented, will be forth coming, should Mr. Pattison, in some disastrous moment, have the temerity to call me into a court of law for the vindication of his character. Challenged again and again to such an investigation, he has as uniformly shrunk from it, preferring in the exercise of a sound discretion, to be *sworn out* by a set of *compurgators*, who, with a noble disinterestedness, have been found ready at all times to assert his innocence at the sacrifice of their own reputation.

N. C.

Nov. 1822.

To rectify the public mind on a subject which has been much misrepresented, I submit the following statement, which appeared in the Philadelphia papers.

To the Public of Philadelphia.

It was my intention, after the transaction recited in the late address of Mr. Granville Sharpe Pattison, to abstain from noticing any thing which he might publish on the subject. I was aware, that he would take advantage of the occasion, to fabricate a tale, which might bring him again within the view of the public, and attract some additional sympathy to his case, heretofore, and with infinite pains,

represented as wonderfully pitiable. But I was at the same time sure, that his statement would be, as it is, of a complexion to betray its own falsehood, and I was not sorry that he himself should make more extensively known the well merited treatment of which he now so sorely complains.

In reflecting on the matter, however, it has occurred to me, that there is an apology due on my part, to my fellow citizens, for the breach of public order and decorum which I am conscious of having committed in the personal attack upon Mr. Pattison, and that it would be well to accompany the apology with some general explanations, tending to counteract the distorted aspect which he has given to the transaction.

As relates to the man, I can feel no regret for what I have done. Nor is he, I am persuaded, much dissatisfied with the occurrence. Notoriety is his great object, and to find an opportunity of figuring before the public as a persecuted and oppressed stranger, he would make almost any personal sacrifice—not attended with any serious danger. It formed the motive to his original selection of me as an antagonist, to the sagacious and prudent neglect of others, who had given him formal and repeated invitations to that effect.

Yet, no one is more sensible than myself, that it became neither my profession, station in society, time of life, nor my general principles and course of conduct, to commit such an act of violence in the streets, upon an individual, however culpable and vile. The example is intrinsically bad—it is such as I should condemn in another, and cannot undertake to justify in myself. I have therefore only the palliative to offer, of the sudden and irresistible excitement, which caused me to forget what was due to myself and to the community.

The nature of my relation with Mr. Pattison, previous to the affair now in agitation, is sufficiently notorious. It predisposed me, as it would have predisposed a more phlegmatic temperament than mine, to a momentary heat, when he

should fall under sight for the first time, after the publication of the pamphlet to which he refers.

It happened on the morning of the 7th instant, the day on which he made his appearance here, that I went out with Mrs. Chapman to pay a visit to her mother, who resides in Spruce, near Fourth street. I had with me a light stick, which I usually carry. As we were walking down Walnut street, I perceived on the opposite side Mr. Pattison with a companion, following in the same direction. He continued in this course for two squares, frequently casting his eye upon me, in a manner which I thought significant. I turned on the right into Fourth street, leaving Mr. Pattison about twenty or thirty yards behind me in conversation with a gentleman who had stopped to address him. Conducting Mrs. Chapman to some distance down Fourth street, I mentioned to her that I was obliged to leave her at that moment, having a call to make in Chesnut street, and requested my brother-in-law, who had accidentally fallen in with us a short time before, to continue his walk with her. My impression was, that neither of them had perceived Mr. Pattison, and I so directed the conversation during the walk, as that it might be prevented. Contrary to expectation, for I had reason to believe that he would have been detained in the position in which I left him, entirely out of the view of my wife, I encountered him turning the corner of Walnut street with his companion, and having apprised him of my intention, dealt him several blows. In the meanwhile, Mrs. Chapman, who had seen him in our walk, concealing however the circumstances from me, under the idea that he had escaped my observation, became so uneasy as to be induced to return in pursuit of me with all speed, and reached the scene of the affray after I had inflicted the blows, and when a peace officer and some persons in the neighbourhood were properly interfering. Mr. Pattison appeared to me to make no resistance till I was seized, and then so extremely agitated was he, as to be incapable of giving a blow.

In vigour of frame he is at least my equal, and the weapon I employed was too slight to place him on an inequality.

I need do no more than repel with scorn his insinuation that I either planned or took advantage of the presence of Mrs. Chapman on the occasion. Those of whose esteem I am desirous, will not believe that I, or any other man, would expose his wife in this way. Mr. Pattison has very adroitly, as he supposes, improved the incident of her presence, which had, in fact, not the least influence, and, of course, has no relevancy to the case. But the manner in which he uses it, and the very introduction of a lady thus gratuitously, with the expectation that her feelings must be torn by being dragged before the public, will serve to illustrate the coarseness, malice, and artfulness of the man.

He informs the world, in italics, that he was, at the time he was struck, bound over to keep the peace. Had this been so, it could not have included self-defence, or have deprived him of that advantage when attacked. The fact, however, is, *that his recognizance expired six months ago!*

There is one point more in his statement, to which I think it well to advert, before I close this explanation, already too long. He remarks, that "a suit at law is foreign to his feelings, and incompatible with his convenience," and takes much credit to himself for his forbearance. His scruples, indeed, in this instance, are very convenient, *because I stand prepared, and he well knows it, to substantiate, in a court of justice, when called into one, all the charges which I have ever made against his moral character.*

N. CHAPMAN.

May 14, 1821.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE
NLM 00988873 0